A

COMMENTARY

ON THE

HOLY SCRIPTURES:

CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND HOMILETICAL,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MINISTERS AND STUDENTS.

BY

JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D.

IN CONNECTION WITH A NUMBER OF EMINENT EUROPEAN DIVINES.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, REVISED, ENLARGED, AND EDITED,

BY

PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

IN CONNECTION WITH AMERICAN SCHOLARS OF VARIOUS EVANGELICAL DENOMINATIONS.

VOL. VII. OF THE NEW TESTAMENT: CONTAINING THE EPISTLES OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS, EPHESIANS, PHILIPPIANS, AND COLOSSIANS.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,
743 AND 745 BROADWAY.

THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

GALATIANS.

BY

OTTO SCHMOLLER, PH. DR.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN,

BY

C. C. STARBUCK, A. M.

EDITED, WITH ADDITIONS,

BY

M. B. RIDDLE, D. D.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,
743 AND 745 BROADWAY.

Trow's
Printing and Bookbinding Co.,
205–213 *East 12th St.*,
NEW YORK.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

TO THE CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND HOMILETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE BIBLE.

GENERAL EDITORS:

Rev. JOHANN PETER LANGE, D.D.,
Consistorial Counselor and Professor of Theology in the University of Bonn.

Rev. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Sacred Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

I. CONTRIBUTORS TO THE GERMAN EDITION.

Rev. C. A. AUBERLEN, Ph.D., D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the University of Basle, Switzerland.

Rev. KARL CHR. W. F. BÄHR, D.D.,
Ministerial Counselor at Carlsruhe.

Rev. KARL BRAUNE, D.D.,
General Superintendent at Altenburg, Saxony.

Rev. PAULUS CASSEL, Ph.D.,
Professor in Berlin.

Rev. CHR. FR. DAVID ERDMANN, D.D.,
Gen. Superintendent of Silesia, and Prof. Honorarius of Theology in the University of Breslau.

Rev. F. R. FAY,
Pastor in Crefeld, Prussia.

Rev. G. F. C. FRONMÜLLER, Ph.D.,
Pastor at Kemnath, Würtemberg.

Rev. KARL GEROK, D.D.,
Prelate and Chief Chaplain of the Court, Stuttgart.

Rev. PAUL KLEINERT, Ph.D., B.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in the University of Berlin.

Rev. CHRIST. FR. KLING, D.D.,
Dean of Marbach on the Neckar, Würtemberg.

Rev. GOTTHARD VICTOR LECHLER, D.D.,
Professor of Theology, and Superintendent at Leipsig.

Rev. CARL BERNHARD MOLL, D.D.,
General Superintendent in Königsberg.

Rev. C. W. EDWARD NAEGELSBACH, Ph.D.,
Dean at Bayreuth, Bavaria.

Rev. J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the University of Utrecht.

Rev. C. J. RIGGENBACH, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the University of Basle.

Rev. OTTO SCHMOLLER, Ph.D., B.D.,
Urach, Würtemberg.

Rev. FR. JULIUS SCHROEDER, D.D.,
Pastor at Elberfeld, Prussia.

Rev. FR. W. SCHULTZ, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in Breslau.

Rev. OTTO ZOECKLER, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the University at Greifswald.

II. CONTRIBUTORS TO THE ANGLO-AMERICAN EDITION.

Rev. CHARLES A. AIKEN, Ph.D., D.D.,
Professor of Christian Ethics and Apologetics at Princeton, N. J.

Rev. SAMUEL RALPH ASBURY, M.A.,
Philadelphia.

EDWIN CONE BISSELL, D.D.
Professor in the Theol. Seminary at Hartford, Ct.

Rev. GEORGE R. BLISS, D.D.,
Professor in Crozer Theological Seminary, Upland, Pa.

Rev. CHAS. A. BRIGGS, D.D.,
Professor of Oriental Languages in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Rev. JOHN A. BROADUS, D.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis at Louisville, Ky.

Rev. TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D.,
Pastor of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church, New York.

Rev. THOMAS J. CONANT, D.D.,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rev. E. R. CRAVEN, D.D.,
Newark, N. J.

Rev. HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., LL.D.,
Chancellor of the University of New York.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS.

Rev. GEO. E. DAY, D.D.,
Professor in Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

Rev. CHAS. ELLIOTT, D.D.,
Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. L. J. EVANS, D.D.,
Professor of New Test. Exegesis in Lane Theol. Seminary, Cincinnati.

Rev. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D.,
Principal and Professor of Divinity in the Free Church College, Glasgow.

Rev. WILLIAM FINDLAY, M.A.,
Pastor of the Free Church, Larkhall, Scotland.

Rev. JOHN FORSYTH, D.D., LL.D.,
Chaplain and Prof. of Ethics and Law in U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.

Rev. FREDERIC GARDINER, D.D.,
Prof. of the Literature of the O. T. in Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Ct.

Rev. ABRAHAM GOSMAN, D.D.,
Lawrenceville, N. J.

Rev. W. HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Oriental Literature in the Theol. Seminary at Princeton, N. J.

Rev. JAMES B. HAMMOND, M.A.,
New York.

Rev. HORATIO B. HACKETT, D.D.,
Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.

Rev. EDWIN HARWOOD, D.D.,
Rector of Trinity Church, New Haven, Conn.

Rev. W. H. HORNBLOWER, D.D.,
Professor of Sacred Rhetoric, etc., in the Theol. Seminary at Alleghany, Pa.

Rev. JOHN F. HURST, D.D.,
President of the Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

Rev. A. C. KENDRICK, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Greek in the University of Rochester, N. Y.

TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D.,
Professor of Oriental Languages in Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

Rev. JOHN LILLIE, D.D.,
Kingston, N. Y.

Rev. SAMUEL T. LOWRIE, D.D.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Rev. J. FRED. McCURDY, M.A.,
Ass't Professor of the Hebrew Language in the Theol. Sem. at Princeton, N. J.

Rev. CHARLES M. MEAD, Ph.D.,
Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature in the Theol. Sem., Andover, Mass.

Rev. J. ISADOR MOMBERT, D.D.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Rev. DUNLOP MOORE, D.D.,
New Brighton, Pa.

Miss EVELINA MOORE,
Newark, N. J.

JAMES G. MURPHY, LL.D.,
Professor in the General Assembly's and the Queen's College at Belfast.

Rev. HOWARD OSGOOD, D.D.,
Professor of the Interpretation of the Old Test. in the Theol. Sem., Rochester, N. Y.

Rev. JOSEPH PACKARD, D.D.
Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary at Alexandria, Va.

Rev. DANIEL W. POOR, D.D.,
Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary at San Francisco, Cal.

Rev. MATTHEW B. RIDDLE, D.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Theol. Seminary at Hartford, Conn.

Rev. CHAS. F. SCHAEFFER, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary at Philadelphia.

Rev. WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Rev. CHAS. C. STARBUCK, M.A.,
Formerly Tutor in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass.

Rev. P. H. STEENSTRA,
Professor of Biblical Literature at Cambridge, Mass.

Rev. JAMES STRONG, D.D.,
Professor of Exegetical Theology in the Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

Rev. W. G. SUMNER, M.A.,
Professor in Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

Rev. C. H. TOY, D.D.,
Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Rev. E. A. WASHBURN, D.D., LL.D.,
Rector of Calvary Church, New York.

WILLIAM WELLS, M.A., LL.D.,
Professor of Modern Languages in Union College, New York.

Rev. C. P. WING, D.D.,
Carlisle, Pa.

Rev. E. D. YEOMANS, D.D.,
Orange, N. J.

EDITOR'S PREFACE TO THE SEVENTH VOLUME.

This volume of the American edition of Lange's *Biblework*, being the seventh of the New Testament Division, embraces the following Epistles of St. Paul:

GALATIANS. By OTTO SCHMOLLER, Ph. D., of Urach, Würtemberg. Translated by C. C. STARBUCK, A. M., with additions by M. B. RIDDLE, D. D.

EPHESIANS AND COLOSSIANS. By KARL BRAUNE, D. D., General Superintendent of Altenburg, Saxony. Translated, enlarged and edited by M. B. RIDDLE, D. D.

PHILIPPIANS. By Dr. BRAUNE. Edited, with additions, by Prof. HACKETT, D. D., formerly of Newton Centre, now of the Theological Seminary at Rochester, N. Y.

The Epistle to the Ephesians had been originally assigned to Prof. Dr. HITCHCOCK, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, but, much to the regret of the general editor, Dr. H. was obliged to abandon the task on account of illness. This interruption and the absence of Dr. Riddle in Germany have caused some delay in the publication of the volume.

The translation was prepared from the last editions of the original. The additions were made with constant reference to the best German as well as English and American commentators, especially to ALFORD, ELLICOTT, LIGHTFOOT, EADIE and HODGE. Dr. EADIE's work on the Galatians appeared after this part of the volume was in type. Dr. SCHENKEL's commentaries on the Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians (1862, 2d ed., 1867),—originally a part of the *Biblework*, but replaced since, for reasons connected with the theological change of the author, by those of Dr. BRAUNE—were also consulted throughout. BRAUNE is an able, careful, concise, sound and judicious exegete. Special attention was paid to the enlargement of the Textual and Exegetical departments. Where the translators differ from the German authors, the reasons are generally given.

Upon the whole, the additions amount to about one third of the volume, and will commend themselves to the judgment of competent readers as a valuable improvement.

The New Testament part of this laborious work is now drawing to a close. The Commentaries on the Gospel of John, and on Revelation will complete it. The former is far advanced and, if the Lord spare the health and strength of the general editor, will be finished during the coming winter.* The commentary on Revelation has not yet appeared in German, but may be expected in a few months, and will be immediately taken in hand. The last part will also contain a complete and careful Index of all the volumes on the New Testament. The Old Testament is progressing more slowly, yet as fast as the nature of the work will admit.

New York, 10 *Bible House*, *Aug.* 24*th*, 1870. PHILIP SCHAFF.

*** In reply to the many inquiries concerning the issue of the volume on John, I beg leave to say that the delay has been occasioned in great part by the death of my dear friend, Dr. Yeomans, to whom it had been originally assigned, and who left his unfinished translation to me as a sacred legacy. I am progressing with the revision and the numerous additions as fast as the multiplicity of my engagements and constant interruptions will at all permit, and I am desirous to make the commentary as full and satisfactory to English readers as I can.**

all events adduce in favor of their German origin the names of the leaders, Leonorius (comp. Leonhardt, Leonore) and Lutharius, that is, Lothar, and also their polity as described by Strabo, according to which their princes, and not their priests, dispensed justice, this being, according to CÆSAR (*Bell. Gall. VI.* 13), a chief distinction between the Gauls and Germans (WIESELER). Tradition relates also, that an army of crusaders was struck with astonishment at hearing all at once, in this region, the Bavarian dialect.

[WIESELER and OLSHAUSEN advocate the Teutonic origin, at which Luther hints in his warning to the Germans against like inconstancy (*Com. Gal.* i. 6). MEYER suggests the mixed origin mentioned above, while Thierry, and other French writers (including the Emperor Napoleon III. *Cæsar. II.* p. 2), claim this settlement of Celts as an evidence of Gallic enterprise. English writers generally advocate the Celtic origin. The matter is ably discussed by LIGHTFOOT, *Galatians, Dissert. I. p.* 235 *sq.*: "Were the Galatians Celts or Teutons?" He maintains that they were Celts, arguing both from the authority of classical writers, and from the philological data furnished by the proper names which remain. But the most convincing argument is drawn from the character of the people. "They are described by the ancient writers as a frank, warlike, impetuous, intelligent and impressible, but unsteady, ostentatious and vain people, strongly resembling the cognate French" (SCHAFF). That their peculiarities were more akin to those of the ancient Gauls and modern Celtic races, than to those of the Teutonic race, ancient or modern, is very evident. Luther might have spared his rebuke about "inconstancy," could he have foretold modern history. LIGHTFOOT (*Introd.* pp. 1-17) speaks of the tough vitality of national character, so strongly marked in the Celts, which is shown also by the Galatians in Asia Minor; the similar *fickle* temperament (i. 6; iii. 1), and even hints that the vices rebuked in this epistle are not foreign to the distinctive character of the Celts, e. g.: v. 21, "drunkenness and revellings;" vi. 6, 7, niggardliness in alms giving; v. 26, "vain glory;" v. 15, "bite and devour one another." Certainly the tendency of the Galatians in religion was toward superstitious ritualism (iii. 3), not to mysticism as among their neighbors, the Phrygians, and to-day the Celtic people have the same tendency. It is worthy of note, if the Celtic extraction be admitted, that those Epistles (*Galatians* and *Romans*) which assail most plainly the errors of legalism and ritualism, should have been addressed to Celtic and Latin readers. The progress of ethnographic science seems to favor the view that the Galatians were Celts. Comp. CONYBEARE and HOWSON: *Life and Epistle of St. Paul, I. p.* 243 *sq.*—R.]

The opinion, that we are to regard, not the Galatians proper, but inhabitants of the district added under King Amyntas, Lycaonians (especially the christians of Derbe and Lystra), and Pisidians, as the recipients of our Epistle, is altogether untenable, owing its rise to hypotheses about the time of its composition.

The recipients of the Epistle are more particularly, the Christian congregations, *αἱ ἐκκλησίαι* of Galatia. There were therefore several Christian churches in this district—perhaps in the chief places, Ancyra, Tavium and Pessinus, according to a missionary principle observed by the Apostle (WIESELER). In the book of Acts also no places are mentioned. In one other passage these churches are spoken of in the same way (1 Cor. xvi. 1). The passages, 2 Tim. iv. 10; 1 Pet. i. 1, also presuppose Christians in Galatia. These churches were founded by Paul himself. This appears indisputably from our Epistle, i. 6–8; iv. 13 sq., and is confirmed by the narrative in the Acts. According to this he came hither for the first time soon after the apostolic council, Acts xvi. 6. He must then have preached the gospel there, and founded churches; for although this is not expressly stated, it is to be assumed, since, at the visit mentioned in Acts xviii. 23, he was already employed in "strengthening" the churches there. A second visit of the Apostle to Galatia is also indicated in our Epistle, especially iv. 13 (comp. *ad. loc.*). The first one is more particularly described as having been occasioned by bodily weakness, which had constrained him to delay in Galatia, and given him opportunity to preach the gospel there. This visit, therefore, cannot well coincide with that mentioned in Acts xviii. 23.

These churches were undoubtedly chiefly composed of Gentile Christians, as is clear from our Epistle, partly from the passages of general reference, i. 16; ii. 9, in which Paul takes pains to prove to the Galatians his vocation as Apostle to the Gentiles, partly and especially from iv. 8, where the readers, as a whole, are designated as having been idolaters, and from v. 2, 3; vi. 12, 13, ac-

cording to which they were as yet uncircumcised. Unquestionably there was also in Galatia a Jewish population, perhaps a numerous one (comp. Josephus, Ant. 12, 3, 4; 16, 6, 2), and so there may have been Jewish Christians also in the churches. But we cannot draw a certain conclusion from the ἡμεῖς in passages which refer especially to Jewish Christians, as iii. 23–25; iv. 3; for we cannot decidedly affirm that here Paul includes the readers also in the first person. The abrupt transition from the first to the second person in iii. 25, 26; iv. 5, 6, might rather favor the opposite conclusion, namely, that he has reference to the readers only in the second part of these passages where he treats of the Christian state, and not in what precedes, respecting the condition of a Jew. [It is by no means certain that the use of the first person in the passages cited involves an exclusive reference to "the condition of a Jew." See EXEG. NOTES, iv. 3.—R.] Nor is the fact that acquaintance with the Old Testament is presupposed in the arguments of the epistle, a convincing proof. For all evangelical preaching rested on the Old Testament Scripture. Besides this, thorough discussion of the Old Testament was here demanded by the subject of the epistle. For the churches were wrought upon by Judaizing false teachers, who endeavored to lead them back to an Old Testament position; as they had doubtless been already sufficiently instructed by these teachers in the Old Testament, on this account alone Paul was obliged to enter on the discussion of the Old Testament, and out of it to refute them; to open up to them a still deeper and juster understanding of the Old Testament economy. Only so could they be delivered from an authority pretending a support from the Old Testament. The supposition that the Galatian Christians had formerly been in great part proselytes, is therefore unnecessary. [SCHAFF: The congregations of Galatia were, like all the churches founded by Paul, of a mixed, yet predominantly Gentile Christian character.—R.]

§ 2. OCCASION OF THE EPISTLE.

The spiritual state of these Galatian churches, at first a matter of joy, had been sadly disturbed by certain unnamed persons, who, to be sure, were Christians, but of Judaizing or pharisaistic tendencies. These, it is plain, had come from abroad, and perhaps were emissaries from Palestine. They were hardly proselytes. Such a conclusion does not follow from v. 12; vi. 13. They set themselves in direct opposition to the Christian view, which had, till then, prevailed in the church; and, moreover, directed their polemics expressly against Paul, as the first promulgator of this view. To the persuasion which had taken root through him, that justification and salvation are to be attained alone through faith in Christ, by grace, they opposed the assertion that certain works of the law, especially the observance of the Jewish festivals, and the receiving of circumcision, were necessary to salvation. From prudential motives, they did not require the observance of the whole law. In order to gain entrance for this view, diametrically opposed as it was to the doctrine of Paul, they sought to undermine the consideration in which the Galatians held him, by denying to him the apostolic dignity, and by appealing, in opposition, to the authority of the senior Apostles, especially James, Peter and John, as the true pillars of the church, to whom Paul, as they represented, stood in opposition, while they proceeded in concurrence with them. Nay, they appear to have even imputed to Paul the *inconsistency* of sometimes himself preaching circumcision among the Jews, v. 11; and would have it, therefore, that his doctrine of the freedom of believers from the law proceeded only from unworthy complaisance towards the Gentiles. (Comp. i. 10.)

How long these false teachers had been working in the church cannot be precisely determined; yet we see from i. 9; v. 3; iv. 16, that Paul, on his second visit, had already spoken against this Judaizing error; chiefly, we may suppose, by way of warning and precautionary instruction, as the danger was yet only imminent, although the inclination to yield was already present. Matters came to an actual leading astray only after the departure of the Apostle. For from the impression which the Epistle makes, we must conclude that he has now, for the first time, to deal with the church after its actual fall into error. This falling away, however, must have made surprisingly rapid progress, as unmistakably appears from the tone of the Epistle; comp. also i. 6: οὕτω ταχέως.

As just remarked, the false teachers actually succeeded in finding entrance and seducing the churches. How far can only be partially determined. At all events, we must not underrate

their success. From the whole tenor of the Epistle from the earnestness with which Paul speaks (e. g. i. 6; iii. i. 3; iv. 12, 19, 20; v. 1 sq. 7), from his thorough handling of the question of his own doctrinal position, and of the question respecting his apostolic authority, as also from the allusion to the division that had arisen in the church (chaps. v. and vi.), it is sufficiently clear that the Judaizing *view*, at least, had already completely got the upper hand, and especially that the consideration enjoyed by the Apostle was already a good deal shaken. (Comp. the peculiarly full exposition of this question in the Epistle.) On the other hand, the apostasy from the principle of justifying faith was as yet by no means complete, but only incipient. (Comp. e. g. i. 6; iv. 9, 17, 21.) Especially the practical observance of Judaism was only in its beginnings. The observance of the Jewish days and times had commenced, but "to the chief requirement of the false teachers, obedience to which would first render the apostasy from evangelical Christianity complete, namely the receiving of circumcision, they had as yet yielded no compliance, in any numbers worth speaking of, since the circumcision of the readers is mentioned as something still impending." On the other hand, we cannot, from the "little leaven," (v. 2), draw the inference of a falling away as yet insignificant, since this expression rather refers to the small number of their corrupters, or rather to the fact that a deviation from evangelical truth in one point or a few points may easily work great mischief.

This condition of the Galatian churches has evidently been speedily reported to the Apostle; for, as yet, all is in the bud; he has still good hope of the Galatians, that all will come right again; he deals with them throughout as having but just set foot on the downward path, and feels himself to be still standing in close connection with them, notwithstanding that, on their side, some estrangement may have already taken place, inasmuch as the personal consideration of the apostle itself had been so directly impugned. Yet he does not appear to have received his intelligence so very soon, but that he speaks of their already having begun to observe days, and months, and times, and years. Though we cannot, of course, from this last expression, draw the inference of their having been already a year in this condition, yet the Judaizing usage in this respect must have already, in some measure, obtained prevalence. Such intelligence is it which gives the Apostle occasion for the writing of our Epistle to the Galatians.

[LIGHTFOOT: "The fragmentary notices of its subsequent career reflect some light on the temper and disposition of the Galatian church in St. Paul's day. Asia Minor was the nursery of heresy, and, of all the Asiatic churches, it was no where so rife as in Galatia. The Galatian capital was the stronghold of the Montanist revival, which lingered on for more than two centuries, splitting into diverse sects, each distinguished by some fantastic gesture or minute ritual observance. Here too were to be found Ophites, Manichæans, sectarians of all kinds. Hence during the great controversies of the fourth century issued two successive bishops (Marcellus and Basilius), who disturbed the peace of the Church, the one on the side of Sabellian, the other of Arian error. A Christian father of this period (GREGORY NAZ.), denounces 'the folly of the Galatians, who abound in many impious denominations.'" Still both in the Diocletian persecution and against Julian, who personally attempted the restoration of heathenism in Galatia, the Christians bore themselves with fortitude and constancy.—R.]

§ 3. TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION: GENUINENESS.

It is evident that Paul composed the Epistle immediately after he had received the unpleasing intelligence, for it is written under the fresh, immediate impression of it, as appears by the troubled style, full of astonishment and strong feeling. If the opinion given above is correct, that Paul himself, in his letter, intimates having made a second visit to Galatia (comp. especially iv. 13), the Epistle was, of course, written after this; and, therefore, if the second visit is the one mentioned, Acts xviii. 23, about A. D. 55 or 56. As Paul, after laboring the second time in Galatia, went to Ephesus, and remained there three years, it is most natural to suppose that he wrote the Epistle in Ephesus. The common subscription says, ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης, and several fathers favor this view, but it has arisen only out of a misunderstanding of iv. 20; vi. 2, and especially of vi. 17.

[Time and place are linked together; the two most probable opinions are: 1. That it was written from Ephesus, A. D. 54–57 (Acts xix. 1–10). 2. From Corinth, A. D. 57–58 (Acts

xx. 3). If 1. be adopted, then it was written before the Epistles to the Corinthians; if 2., then subsequently. 1. is held by as more probable among others by MEYER, LANGE, SCHAFF (*History of the apostolic church, p.* 282), REUSS (*Gesch. der heil. Schriften des N. T.* 4th ed. p. 73), ALFORD, ELLICOTT, DAVIDSON, TURNER; 2. by DE WETTE, CONYBEARE, BLEEK, and by LIGHTFOOT most decidedly. STANLEY and JOWETT, leave the question undetermined, while WORDSWORTH dates it as early as A. D. 53, before Paul's second visit from Corinth, during his first visit there. (See his *Introd.* to *Gal.*) As the first named is the view generally received, it will be proper to state more fully the arguments of LIGHTFOOT. 1. The resemblance to the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and that to the Romans, between which he would place it, its affinity in tone of feeling to the former, and in thought to the latter. 2 This order best accords with the history of Paul's personal sufferings and the progress of his controversy with the Judaizers, as shown in the fulness of doctrinal statement against their views. 3. This date explains one or two allusions more satisfactorily, as vi. 1, against severe treatment, the evil effects of which he may have witnessed at Corinth; vi. 7: "Be not deceived," *etc.*, referring to their illiberality in response to the "orders to the churches of Galatia," mentioned 1 Cor. xvi. 1. See LIGHTFOOT, pp. 36–56. The question is one of probabilities, yet, as respects internal evidence, it may be remarked that the strong emotion of the Galatian Epistle renders it more probable that it was written speedily after the news of their error had come to the Apostle, while the calmer, more didactic setting of the same truth in the Epistle to the Romans indicates the lapse of a considerable interval between the two. Hence, the earlier date, from Ephesus, is to be preferred, and until lately was generally allowed by the best commentators. The view of WORDSWORTH, assigning a yet earlier date, involves a somewhat forced intepretation of iv. 13, 14, and, while ingeniously supported, rests too entirely upon hypotheses respecting Paul's course in dealing with an erring church.—R.]

Although the apostolic fathers contain no trace even measurably certain, and Justin's writings only a probable trace of the Epistle, its genuineness is nevertheless so firmly established, that it has never yet been doubted. It is supported partly by external, and partly by internal testimony. As to the former, the Epistle is already in use by the Gnostic Valentine (IREN. *Adv. hær.* 3: 3.) and by his disciple THEODOTUS (*Exc. ap. Clem. Alex.* c. 53*); and by MARCION about the middle of the second century, who has it in his canon as the first of the Pauline epistles, and draws his chief arguments from it to prove the other apostles Judaizers (*Epiph. hær*, 42: 9); it is known to Tatian (JEROME, *Comm. in Gal.* 6); it is found on the testimony of the elder Peshito in the Syrian church; and according to the CANON of MURATORI, composed in 170, it is found in the church of the Occident; towards the end of the second century, it is used by the fathers IRENÆUS [*Adv. hær.* III. 7, 2—R.], CLEM. ALEX. [*Strom.* III. p. 468—R.] and TERTULLIAN [*De Præscript. hær.* c. 6—R]; and, finally, it is reckoned by EUSEBIUS among the Homologoumena. Yet stronger is the thoroughly Pauline character and style of the Epistle. The Tübingen school, far from denying its genuineness, uses it rather as the great lever of its criticism upon the writings whose genuineness this school impugns. The sole exception to this universal consent is BRUNO BAUR (*Kritik der Paulin. Br.*, 1*ste Abtheilung*, 1850), who has discovered in the author a compiler, that fabricated the Epistle out of that to the Romans and the two to the Corinthians. His imaginary proof, however, is so utterly without foundation, or scientific worth, that it bears its refutation on its face (WIESELER, MEYER).

§ 4. OBJECT, STYLE AND COURSE OF THOUGHT OF THE EPISTLE.

As implied in the occasion of writing indicated above, the Apostle intended by this, his Epistle, to destroy the influence which the Judaizing teachers, with their legal doctrine, had gained in the Galatian churches, and to bring anew to general acknowledgment, in the first place his apostolic authority, and next, on this basis, the gospel preached by him of the sinner's justification through faith, and of the freedom of the believer from the law. His essential aim is, to bring back the misled Galatians into the right path, as he also cherishes the strong hope, that he shall succeed in this. To this end he exhorts them most earnestly to a return, and supports this ad-

* ["Where Gal. iii. 19, 20 is quoted: but the date and authorship of these excerpts are uncertain" (LIGHTFOOT).—R.]

monition by a careful demonstration of the perversity of that which the false teachers have brought in the way.

Inasmuch, therefore, as the Epistle has as its object, on the one hand, the combatting of an intriguing attempt, that had succeeded but too well, to destroy a work which had had a fair beginning, and at the same time, the combatting of a general doctrine of error, which overturned the evangelical foundation; and on the other hand the bringing back of a beloved church, which had erred from the truth, and the firm establishment of a momentous fundamental truth of the gospel, it is easy to explain the style of strong feeling which the Apostle on the whole maintains. Especially may we thus explain the sharp earnestness with which ever and anon he breaks forth against the false teachers; the zeal of love pervaded by sadness, with which he seeks to persuade the readers of their error, and to make clear the matter to them in the most varied aspects; while. with all this personal reference he does not shrink from going into the most thorough exposition of that which had been brought into doubt.

In treating a writing of such a kind, nothing is more mistaken than the desire to dispose it according to scholastic rules. It is true, the thought moves in thoroughly close connection, and a steady and clear progress is found, but the whole is a living growth, where one thing grows out of the other in the most immediate connection. With all the steadiness of the progress of thought, there prevails also a freedom of movement, and all pedantic analysis does violence to this mighty gush of thought.

As usual, Paul begins his Epistle with an ADDRESS and SALUTATION (i. 1–5), except that even here, agreeably to the purpose of the Epistle he emphasizes his apostolate in a very peculiar manner, i. 1, and brings into prominence the significance of the atoning death of Christ (i. 4). Then entering at once upon the matter, he sets forth the *occasion of the Epistle*, by expressing his astonishment at the speedy entrance which false teachers had found into the Galatian churches; and against every one, who preaches another gospel than that which he had brought them, denounces the Anathema—a severity which he justifies by reference to his duty as a servant of Christ (i. 6–10). There follows now:

I. The clearly marked FIRST CHIEF DIVISION of the Epistle (I. 4—II. 21)—*a detailed demonstration of his full apostolic dignity, and thereby of the full authority of his evangelical preaching.* Although the polemical reference is not distinctly announced, this is of course in definite opposition to the attacks of his opposers. Because this was the point of departure, the base of operations for the legal doctrine, he accordingly refutes these attacks first and before all, in order to have a foundation for what follows. For only by re-establishing his apostolic consideration, could he hope to destroy the influence which the false teachers and their legal doctrine had won and to convince his readers of the truth of his own preaching. The proof Paul conducts in the following manner. He shows,

(1), How he had received his commission to preach the gospel from God and Christ Himself, through special revelation, and not otherwise, as from the senior Apostles; how he could not possibly have received it from these, since for a long time he had only come once into hasty communication with them (vers. 11–24).

(2), That during a later interview in Jerusalem with the senior Apostles, having reference to doctrine, the latter by no means assumed any authority over him, or uttered any censure of his course; that on the contrary, while he, in opposition to the false brethren, most decidedly upheld the evangelical truth, it was precisely by the "pillars" of the church, the Apostles James, Peter and John that he was acknowledged as an Apostle of equal authority, and the preaching among the Gentiles left to him by a free and friendly agreement (ii. 1–10).

(3), That when Peter, although himself fully committed to the freer view respecting the Mosaic law, yet from fear of man had once deviated from it, he had not hesitated publicly to rebuke him, and to lay before him in the most definite manner the principles of his preaching among the Gentile Christians, in order to guard against these being led astray (ii. 11, 26). With Chap. iii. Paul passes over:

II. to a new section, the HEART of the whole Epistle. In this, *he sets himself in complete opposition to the legal tendency itself*, or to the opinion of a *necessity of the observance of the law to the attainment of salvation*, which, in opposition to the evangelical view inculcated by him,

had found entrance, by means of the false teachers, among the Galatians. In this part, doctrine, complaint, and admonition alternate with one another (III. 1—VI. 10).

A. He begins (iii. 1–5) by expressing astonishment at the opposition into which they thus come with their own *experience* in the receiving of the Spirit, and then:

B. For the first time passes into a *doctrinal exposition*, namely,

1. To the proof of the principle, that through *works of the law*, Salvation (Justification, Blessedness, Inheritance) is *not to be obtained, but through Faith alone.* (iii. 6–18). The proof of this he finds in the Scripture, partly in the testimony of the Scripture concerning the justification of Abraham through faith, partly in the promise given to Abraham, that in him all the Gentiles shall be *blessed;* which promise finds its fulfilment only through faith in Christ, since the law intead of a blessing, brings a curse, while Christ has become a curse, in order to redeem us from that curse (iii. 6–14). The principle to be proved is, moreover, indicated even by the *relation of time* between the law and the covenant of promise. According to a fundamental principle of law, universally valid, the law, as given much later, could not annul the promise, that is, works of law could not be subsequently made a condition of attaining the inheritance, after it had been first promised as a gift (iii. 15–18). Paul, however, does not content himself with this demonstration, which, in relation to the law, afforded a merely negative result, nor indeed could the readers content themselves with it, since the *fact* of the law was not thereby explained. He therefore passes now:

2. To the *Law itself*, and its *relation to* the *covenant of promise*, and shows, (positively), *what significance attaches to the law, in order therefrom to demonstrate, definitely and positively the freedom of Christians from the same* (iii. 19; iv. 7).

a) The law had its sufficient end, one having an important reference even to the attainment of salvation. This end, however, was only preparatory, namely, to prepare the way, as a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ.

b) But from this itself appears the merely transitory significance of the law: with the coming in of faith, the way forwhich it was to prepare, this ceases; believers are now all, without distinction, God's children, and so heirs (iii. 25–29). That is, remarks Paul more definitely still:

c) God's children and heirs (as were the children of Israel), might, it is true (after the analogy of human relations), be placed in servitude under the law, during their state of minority, but with the sending of the Son of God the stated majority, and with it the full position of children and heirs, has come in, which finds its realization in fact through the Spirit's inward witness of adoption (iv. 1–7). With this, the didactic exposition is, in its main part completed, and the Apostle's painful sense of the contrast in which the present behavior of the Galatians stands to the freedom from the law, which has fallen to the portion of Christians and therefore to them also, forces him again:

C. To a *lamentation* over this behavior of theirs. He presents before them the inconceivable retrogression which they make, and also, in painfully agitated language, the equally groundless personal estrangement, which had sprung up between themselves and him, through the selfish intrigues of the false teachers (iv. 8–18).

D. His complaint, pervaded by the motherly wish for a restoration of misguided children to the right way,* unconsciously passes over once more into *instruction*, into a *confirmation* of what had been taught concerning the freedom of Christians, from the *Scripture* narrative of the two sons of Abraham, Ishmael and Isaac, by means of an interpretation referring these to the Jewish and the Christian churches (iv. 19–31).

E. This gives so much the better right to utter the *admonition* to stand fast in this freedom from the law; an admonition which is at once strengthened by a *threatening* reference to the *dangerous consequences* of a return to the law, even in the one point of circumcision: that thus they lost Christ in whom alone that faith which works by love is efficacious (v. 1–6).

F. This admonition and warning now suggesting the thought how much lies at stake, pass over again into *complaint*, through which, however, hopefulness is visible, the complaint taking rather the form of accusation against their false guides (v. 7–12).

G. But so much the more urgently is the *admonition* again pressed, in the form of an exhor-

*[Vers. 19, 20, containing this motherly wish, seem to belong more properly to the preceding section, and are thus joined by most commentators. The illustration or allegory (vers. 21–30) then forms a section by itself.—R.]

tation (supplementing that under E.), instead of returning to the law, as if faith were insufficient to accredit their faith, in a right understanding of the freedom bestowed on believers, by a serving *love*, through a walk in the *Spirit*, which is the best fulfilling of the law. This admonition is given *a*) more in general, and with reference to the principle on which it rests, namely, the opposition between Flesh and Spirit; *b*) with a special inculcation of the duty of love in several particular relations, for which the churches may have given occasion (v. 25—vi. 10).

VI. 11-18. Paul adds a CONCLUSION written with his own hand.* In this with a few strokes he portrays himself in opposition to the false teachers, and opposes to their shrinking from persecution his own joy in the cross of Christ, through which he has become a new man. Wishing then a blessing on all who walk according to the principles laid down by him, he alludes to the marks of the Lord Jesus in his body, and begs that henceforth no man may trouble him, closing with the accustomed benediction.

[Subjoined is the satisfactory summary of DR. SCHAFF, published as a part of a projected commentary:

The object of the Epistle was both apologetic and polemic. It is a personal and a doctrinal self-defence, and a refutation of the Judaizing heresy. To this are added appropriate exhortations.

The first part, chap. i. 1—ii. 14, is historical and personal, giving a resumé of the Apostle's career, partly confirmatory, partly supplementary to the narrative of the Acts, and justifying his office and authority from the direct call of Christ, the revelation of the gospel doctrine made to him, and the testimony of the other Apostles during the Council of Jerusalem.

In the second or doctrinal part, chap. ii. 15—iv. 31, he defends his teaching, the free gospel of Christianity, in opposition to the slavish and carnal legalism of his opponents.

In the third or practical part, chaps. v. vi., he exhorts the Galatians to hold fast to the evangelical liberty without abusing it, to study love, unity and other Christian virtues, and concludes with a benediction.

Comp. the able analysis of LIGHTFOOT, which may be roughly sketched as a division into three sections of two chapters each: the first couplet *Personal*, the second *Doctrinal*, the third *Hortatory*.—R.]

§ 5. VALUE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EPISTLE.

The high doctrinal importance of our Epistle needs no proof. It is the *Magna Charta* of the freedom of a Christian man. A spirit of holy zeal for the freedom which the Christian has through his faith, and for the Christian's right thereto, breathes through the whole. Hereby is the freedom which we have in Christ, established for all time; and against all attempts to induce it to make a law, or any outward performances, the condition of salvation, the Christian commonwealth can always oppose our Epistle as its charter of manumission. Our Reformers, therefore, in contending against the yoke, which the papacy, in the course of time, had again laid on the Christian conscience, supported themselves chiefly on our Epistle, and the nearly related Epistle to the Romans: and "through the famous exposition of its doctrinal contents rendered by Luther, has it become for ever part and parcel of the church of the Reformation." WIESELER.

A more particular comparison presents the doctrine of justification by faith, and not by works of the law, as, it is true, developed in the Epistle to the Romans with greater fulness, "according to its essence and its effects, in contrast with the corruption of sin;" in our Epistle it is brought forward rather as a means of proving the freedom of Christians from the obligation of observing the law. In this direction, then, are we to look for the peculiar significance of our Epistle: in the firm establishment of the high and holy right which Christians have to this freedom through their faith, in the demonstration of the dignity which faith in Christ bestows, so that our Epistle might be called not only the Christian's deed of manumission, but also his patent of nobility. At the same time the relation of law and promise, of religious childhood and maturity, from which this freedom results, are so clearly exhibited, in a profound and noble interpretation of the history of salvation, as to give a sure and immovable basis for all more special exposition.

* [On the disputed point whether the whole letter or only this conclusion was written by Paul's own hand, see notes on vi. 11.—R.]

But decidedly as the Apostle enters the lists to combat for the freedom of a Christian man, he is just as far from overlooking its ethical character, so that in our Epistle, both the dogmatical and the ethical features, essential to the idea of evangelical freedom, are contained.

While our Epistle is thus, first and chiefly, of high, abiding worth for Christian *doctrine*, it is moreover, important for the *history* of the church, through the valuable communications which it gives in chaps. i. and ii., respecting the history of the Apostle, and of the beginnings of Christianity generally. Considering the indisputable genuineness of the Epistle, these accounts, as being statements of the Apostle himself, are peculiarly valuable; and, although it is true that they have been abused by negative criticism of a destructive tendency, for the construction of its own system, yet the unprejudiced Church historian will, on the other hand, use them only the more effectively, as a sure starting point, with which what is elsewhere related respecting the state of things in early Christianity connects itself, and with which it unites itself to form a harmonious whole.

[SCHAFF: "The Epistle is polemical, impetuous and overpowering; and yet tender, affectionate and warning in tone. It strikes like lightning every projecting point that approaches its path, and yet undelayed by these zigzag deflexions, instantaneously attains the goal. Every verse breathes the spirit of the great and free Apostle of the Gentiles. His earnestness and mildness, his severity and love, his vehemence and tenderness, his depth and simplicity, his commanding authority and sincere humility, are here vividly brought before us in fresh and bold outlines." A half barbarous people, like the Galatians, known for their simplicity and impressibility, would be likely to listen to both of these methods of address; to be won by his fatherly pleading, as well as over-awed by his apostolic rebukes and denunciations (ALFORD).

LUTHER said of it, "The Epistle to the Galatians is my Epistle; I have betrothed myself to it; it is my wife." And he might well thus speak of "his most efficient engine in overthrowing the mass of error which time had piled on the simple foundations of the gospel." "In this epistle we have to this day the divine right and divine seal of genuine Protestantism against Romanism as far as this is a revival of Judaism, and denies to the Christian man that liberty 'wherewith Christ hath made us free.' But it is also, at the same time, an earnest protest against all pseudo-protestantism, which would abuse the evangelical freedom and pervert it into carnal license" (SCHAFF).

Besides furnishing the keenest weapons for the Reformers in their struggle for liberty within the camp, it is now of like value in the war of defence against assailants from without. This Epistle affords the refutation of that rationalistic view, which claims that the earliest form of Christianity was a modified Judaism, but that the distinctive features of our Christianity were added by Paul, which distinctive features prevailed after a long struggle between the Apostles and their antagonistic doctrines. True we here see the mutual jealousy of the Jew and Gentile converts, and are told of personal but temporary disagreement between Paul and Peter, yet are also shown the true relation between Paul and the Twelve; in fact, both the narrative and argument of the Epistle lose their point, if any such continued antagonism be admitted. See LIGHTFOOT, *Introd. p.* 58.—R.]

§ 6. LITERATURE.

Of Antiquity—The well-known works of CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, ŒCUMENIUS, THEOPHYLACT, JEROME, AMBROSIASTER (Hilary), AUGUSTINE, PELAGIUS, CLAUDIUS of Turin. Of the time of the Reformation—The classical exposition of LUTHER: 1. *In epistolam Pauli ad Galatas commentarius* (*minor*) *primum anno* 1519 *excusus, anno* 1523 *ab auctore recognitus.* 2. *In epist. Pauli ad Gal. Commentarius* (*major*) *ex prælectionibus Dr. M. Lutheri collectus a M. Georg. Rorario, a Luthero recognitus et castigatus, primum anno* 1535 *Viteb. excusus.* Translated into German by Justus Menius; published separately, among others, by J. G. Walch, 1737; a new impression in 1856, by G. Schlawitz. (This detailed exposition is used in the present commentary).* Also, CALVIN: *In Novi Testamenti epist. commentarii.*

*[Schmoller uses Luther's Commentary so largely in the Homiletical department of this work, that it almost requires an apology. Which apology may be made in the words of JOHN BUNYAN: "This methinks I must let fall before all men, I do prefer this book of Martin Luther upon the Galatians, excepting the Holy Bible, before all books that ever I have seen, as most fit for a wounded conscience."—R.]

Among modern commentators, besides WINER, RÜCKERT, USTERI, SCHOTT, DE WETTE, BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS, the most noteworthy are, MEYER, *Kritisch-exeg. Handbuch über den Brief an die Galater* [4th ed., 1862.—R.]; EWALD: *Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, 1857; WIESELER: *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Galater. Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Lehre und Geschichte des Apostels*, 1859.—JATHO: *Pauli Brief an die Galater, nach seinem inneren Gedankengang*, 1856.—HOLSTEN: *Inhalt und Gedankengang des Briefs an die Galater*, Rostock, 1859.—VON HOFMANN: *Die heilige Schrift Neuen Testamentes*, 2 Thl. 1 Abth. *Brief an die Galater*, 1863.—DE WETTE: *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch*, II. 3, *Briefe an die Galater und Thessalonicher*, 3. Aufl. ed. Dr. Möller, 1864.

[G. W. MATTHIAS: *Der Galaterbrief griechish und deutsch, nebst einer Erklärung seiner schwierigeren Stellen*, etc., Cassel, 1865.—R.]

For the practical exposition of the epistle, besides STARKE'S *Bibelwerk*; BENGEL, *Gnomon*; RIEGER, *Betrachtungen über das Neue Testament*; M. F. ROOS, a contemporary of these, *Kurze Auslegung des Briefs St. Pauli an die Galater*, 1786 (a small, but admirable tractate); in this century: F. MÜLLER, formerly pastor at Wandsbeck, *Brief Pauli an die Galater, in Bibelstunden erklärt*, 1853; ANACKER, the same, 1856; TWELE, *Galaterbrief in Predigten ausgelegt*, 1858; A. FRANZ: *Die Rechtfertigung durch den Glauben, Homiletische Auslegung der Ep. St. Pauli an die Galater*, 1860; and HEUBNER, *Praktische Erklarung des Neuen Testaments*. B. 3. 1858.

[For a full list and notices of patristic commentaries, see LIGHTFOOT, p. 223 sq.

Luther's commentary was translated into English, and published under the approval of the Bishop of London, 1575. So highly esteemed was this work that there are but few early English commentaries. We may notice, however, THOMAS LUSHINGTON: *Commentary on the Galatians*, London, 1650. JAMES FERGUSON, Edinburgh, 1659.

Of later works, the following are prominent:

J. A. HALDANE: *Commentary*. 1848.

JOHN BROWN: *An exposition of the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians*. Edinburgh, 1853.

C. J. ELLICOTT: *A Commentary, critical and grammatical, of the Epistle to the Gal., with a revised translation*. London, 1853. 3d edition, 1863. The first commentary of this lucid, exact, and scholarly author, whose translation has been largely used in the emendations of the English text in the present work.

B. JOWETT: *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians and Romans, with critical notes and illustrations*. London, 1856.

SAMUEL H. TURNER: *The Epistle to the Galatians in Greek and English, with an analysis and exegetical commentary*. New York, 1856.

H. T. J. BAGGE: *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians, with a revised text and commentary*. London, 1857.

J. B. LIGHTFOOT: *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. A revised text with introduction, notes and dissertations*. London, 1865. Exceedingly valuable, on account of its full discussion of difficult questions. The frequent citations from this work are made from the Second Edition. 1866.

The American Editor of Lange's Commentary, PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., has published an Introduction and comments on chaps. i., ii., as a specimen of a projected popular commentary on the New Testament. Mercersburg Review, Jan., 1861. Most of the material there presented is incorporated here.

The History of the Apostolic Church of the same author treats of many questions belonging to the exposition of this Epistle. So CONYBEARE and HOWSON, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*. The works of ALFORD, WORDSWORTH, BURKITT, HENRY, and others (for full list, see General Introduction to New Testament, LANGE'S *Comm. Matthew*), include comments on this Epistle. The reader is also referred to the Introduction to the Pauline Epistles in the volume on the Epistle to the Romans.—R.]

THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.*

Introduction: ADDRESS AND SALUTATION (WITH BENEDICTION).

CHAPTER I. 1–5.

1 Paul, an apostle, (not [apostle not][1] of men, neither by [through, διά] man, but
by [through] Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead;)
2 [omit parenthesis] And all the brethren which [who] are with me, unto the churches
3 of Galatia: [.] Grace *be* to you, and peace, from God the Father, and *from* our[2]
4 Lord Jesus Christ, Who gave himself for[3] our sins, that he might deliver us from
5 this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father: To whom *be*
glory for ever and ever. Amen.

* [TITLE: Rec. ἡ πρὸς Γαλάτας ἐπιστολὴ Παύλου. Elz. Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἡ πρὸς Γαλάτας ἐπιστολή. ℵ. A. B. K., Lachmann, Tischendorf and most editors, πρὸς Γαλάτας.—R.]

[1] Ver. 1.—[The comma after "apostle," and the parenthesis are better omitted, since the clauses immediately following "Apostle" are most closely connected with it, and the idea so far from being parenthetical is one of the most prominent in the whole Epistle. "Of" is changed to "from" by Ellicott, while he retains "by" as a sufficiently exact translation of διά.—R.]

[2] Ver. 3.—ℵ. inserts ἡμῶν after πατράς, omitting it after κυρίου. [This reading is an alteration to conform with other salutations (Meyer). That of Rec. is undoubtedly correct. So all modern editors.—R.]

[3] Ver. 4.—Περί (instead of ὑπέρ. Rec.) is found in most MSS. and in the best MSS. ℵ. also, though ℵ[3]., reads ὑπέρ. [The external authorities are decisive against the reading of the Rec.; περί is adopted by modern editors almost universally.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Paul, an apostle not of men, neither through man,** *etc.*—His office, Paul says, is not derived from men (ἀπ᾽ ἀνθρώπων), so as to be in itself human, and therefore subservient only to human interests; nor has it even been committed to him through the medium of any man (δι᾽ ἀνθρώπου), in which case it might still be a divine function, although only not directly so. The change of number is only of secondary importance. The general sense: "of human derivation," is better expressed by the indefinite plural; while on the other hand, in denying human mediation, the singular is used with more precision, by Paul, the rather, as having already in mind the definite antithesis "but by Jesus Christ."

This double negation is essentially only a setting forth of the definition of "Apostle." He would be in no event an Apostle, if he had his office, ἀπ᾽ ἀνθρ.; nor yet, if he had it, δι᾽ ἀνθρ. He would then stand only on equal footing with a Timothy and others, in short with all laborers in the gospel, who are inducted into their office by men; he is an Apostle only because called and inducted into his office, **through Jesus Christ**, *etc.* He was therefore placed in his office immediately through Christ, not through a man; for the activity of Ananias in Damascus had been only secondary and subsequent, the beginnings were divine. But, furthermore, he has received his office through Christ from God the Father, so that, as "through Jesus Christ" explains "not through man," so **God the Father** explains "not of men." Yet Paul does not place this θεοῦ πατρ. in express antithesis to ἀπ᾽ ἀνθρ., inasmuch as he does not say ἀπὸ θεοῦ π. There being on the positive side no occasion for so precise a discrimination, he here no longer distinguishes between author and medium: perhaps not without design, in order thus to set his apostleship in a like direct relation, as to Christ, so to God the Father, and thereby to place the dignity of the same so much the more strongly in view. What in the first place constitutes the apostolic office, is the immediate calling through Christ, who is the κύριος ἀποστέλλων (on which account διὰ Ἰ. Χρ. is placed before καὶ πατρος). Christ Himself, certainly, cannot be reduced to the same level with men, if "not of men," *etc.*, is to remain true. And every thought of it is precluded by this very comprehending of Christ with God the Father, as it were, in one conception, under one preposition.

[ELLICOTT neatly paraphrases thus: "Not from men as an ultimate, nor through man as a mediate authority." The second ἀπό which we should expect to find before θεοῦ πατρός has not been omitted without good reason: while the preposition διά admits an extension of meaning that would cover both ideas (MEYER), the Apostle's language, as it stands, is more forcible; the directness of his divine commission is emphasized (LIGHTFOOT), and although an argument for the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, must not be forced from the passage, "there is something *very* noticeable in this use of a common preposition with both the first and second Persons of the Trinity, by a writer so cumulative, and yet for the most part so exact in his use of prepositions as St. Paul" (ELLICOTT). SCHAFF: "*By* includes here the instrumental and the more remote originating cause.—The immediate coördination of Christ with God the Father, and this in contrast with the preceding *men* and *man*, prove that the Apostle regarded the Saviour as a Divine being."—R.]

Paul here, probably, designates God the Father [*i. e.*, "of Christ,"—R.] as **who raised him from the dead**, simply because through this divine act, namely, the resurrection of Christ, his own immediate vocation through Christ had been made possible (1 Cor. xv. 8). [While it is not necessary to insist on a polemic reference here, as an answer to the reproach that he had not seen Christ (CALVIN), there seems to be an *immediate* reference to the fact that Paul was called by the exalted Christ, not that he claimed a preëminence on this account (AUGUSTINE, ERASMUS, and others), but God having raised Christ from the dead, and Christ having immediately chosen him to be an Apostle, it was fitting that he should give prominence here to that act of God which enabled him also to be an Apostle, a witness of the resurrection.—R.]

This laying claim so expressly to apostolic dignity in the very introduction, stands (as is shown by what follows) in connection with the vital questions of the Epistle, since his equal apostolic rank had been impugned by the Galatian false teachers. In chap. i. 11–ii. *fin.* there follows the detailed proof of this "not through man, but through Jesus Christ," whereby the "not of men" is also indirectly proved. (In other Epistles, where he has not this definite purpose in mind, Paul designates himself more simply, but in substantially the same style as ἀπόστολος or κλητὸς ἀπ. Ἰ. Χρ. διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ.)

Ver. 2. **And all the brethren who are with me.**—Hardly his companions in travel at that time merely, especially helpers in his office (MEYER), but rather all the Christians of his place of residence at that time. This addition has, at all events, the special purpose of adding the authority of others to his own. He wishes the Galatians to understand, that he has on his side all the brethren in the midst of whom he writes, that these have the same opinion of their conduct, and thus indicates that the Galatians, unless they came to another mind, would sever themselves from the great communion of the brethren, who stand and abide upon the foundation of faith which Paul had laid. Of course the Apostle alone wrote the Epistle. He can, however, bring in the brethren as joint authors, so far as they may, after a previous communication of the leading thoughts, or, more probably, after hearing the Epistle itself read, have signified their agreement with it. [The more restricted meaning is allowable (see Phil. iv. 21, 22, where "the brethren which are with me" are distinguished from "all the saints.") The idea of the patristic commentators, that thus additional authority would be given, is incorrect; "the Epistle, being the product of an infallible Apostle, required no such help" (SCHAFF). CALVIN's remark is just, however: "The concurrence of so many godly persons must have had some degree of influence in softening the minds of the Galatians, and preparing them to receive instruction." ELLICOTT: "He adopts the inclusive term to show the unanimity that was felt on the subject of the Epistle; did it mean the whole Christian community we should certainly have expected 'with whom I am' rather than 'who are with me.'"—R.]

Unto the churches of Galatia.—The same title, 1 Cor. xvi. 1. There existed there, it seems, therefore, different local congregations, of which each one constituted at least a relatively complete whole, and the Epistle was so far a circular letter. The omission of a phrase of commendation, such as is usually found in the other Epistles of the Apostle, has perhaps its ground in dissatisfaction with the Galatians. Perhaps, however, the omission is in part attributable to the external circumstance, that ἐκκλησίαι, whole congregations, are addressed, hence any such titles as κλητοί, ἅγιοι, would have been less suitable. [The dissatisfaction of the Apostle is so natural and evident a reason for the omission of any commendatory addition to the simple address, that any other explanation is farfetched. ALFORD quotes MEYER as saying that 1 and 2 Thess. present a similar instance, but in the 4th ed. MEYER expressly mentions these Epistles as no exceptions. WORDSWORTH: "a remarkable address in what it does *not*, as well as in what it does say."—R.]

Ver. 3. **Grace be to you—and peace.**—Respecting the Pauline form of salutation, χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη, consult remarks on the other Epistles.—**From God the Father and our Lord,** *etc.* As in ver. 1. Christ and the Father were comprehended under the one preposition διά, without distinction of the Father through an ἀπό, so here the reverse takes place, an evident token how little Paul has in mind a severance of the Divine Persons. Christ is by no means, then, the merely instrumental medium of grace, but, as well as the Father Himself, the Bestower of grace (see DOCTRINAL and ETHICAL notes). Here, however, "God the Father" is placed first; in ver. 1 the order was reversed. There is, moreover, a special reason here for placing "our Lord Jesus Christ" last, namely, that it receives in addition a predicate defining it more closely. Grace and peace, Paul wishes for the Galatians, especially in view of the path of error into which they had been led, and for this very reason with especial allusion to that, which alone secures this grace and this peace, namely, the atoning death of Christ.

Who gave Himself for us.—In this clause the Apostle anticipates the other main point which he has to unfold. Instead of regarding the cross of Christ alone as the ground of salvation, the false teachers had influenced the Galatians to seek salvation again in observance of the law. In ver. 1 Paul touches on the personal, here he touches on the doctrinal question, which he afterwards handles. Δόντος ἑαυτόν, "gave *Himself*," nothing less than His own person, which could be fully accomplished only in His death. Περί undefined: "in respect to our sins." The sense, however, clearly appears not only from the following, "that He might deliver us," but also in the very form of the expression, which sets forth an expiatory sacrifice that has been offered, in which Christ was the Offerer and the Offered, the Highpriest and the Sacrifice, in one person (comp. WIESELER's careful investigation of the use of περί, ὑπέρ, ἀντί, in declarations respecting the death of Christ). [ELLICOTT: In its ethical sense, ὑπέρ retains some trace of its local meaning, "bending over to protect," and thus points more immediately to the action, than to the object or circumstance from which the action is supposed to spring. The latter relation is more correctly defined by περί, which is thus more naturally used with the thing, "sins," ὑπέρ with the persons, "sinners." Often, however, in the N. T. the distinction is scarcely appreciable.—R.]

Ver. 4. **That He might deliver us.**—Effect of the expiation accomplished through Christ.—'Εξαιρεῖσθαι, to tear away from a power. The evil world is viewed as possessor by force, as a tyrant, who brings destruction, and in whose power we are by nature. This deliverance Paul doubtless understands in a double sense, as a making free from the moral corruption of the world, and also as a keeping from the destruction which it thereby brings upon its own at the judgment day. The immediate reference is to the latter, which, however, in view of the ethical character of Christianity, cannot take place without the former, as indeed there can be no doubt that the death of Christ has an ethical intent. It is false, however, to think only of this here.—"Present world" may mean, present or impending age. The latter signification is, however, hardly to be assumed here—contrary to MEYER, who would take it as meaning the evil times which, according to many passages of Scripture, are shortly to precede the second coming of Christ, and on this account are wont elsewhere to be called the last times. But "our phrase, on account of the union of ἐνεστώς with αἰών, is most naturally regarded as parallel with ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος or ὁ νῦν αἰών. The expression ὁ αἰών, since this appears to denote a period of time complete in itself, is nowhere used of the last times, preparatory only, as the pangs of travail, to the αἰὼν μέλλων. Nor, finally, is there in the connection the least reason why Paul should have confined the salutary workings of the redeeming death of Jesus to the last times." (WIESELER). Therefore we must take it as, "the present period of time," in sense the same as ὁ κόσμος, so that the translation "present world," is substantially correct.—"Evil" emphasizes the ethical character of "this world," which is besides included in the very conception of "the present world." It is equivalent to "ruined by sin," and therefore a deliverance out of it was necessary in the twofold relation given above. [SCHAFF: "The words contain an allusion to the Jewish distinction between 'this world,' and 'the world to come,' or the period before, and the period after the appearance of the Messiah. But the sense of these terms is modified in the N. T., so as to make the *second* coming of Christ the dividing line between the two æons." LIGHTFOOT: "The distinction of time between the two, which is the primary distinction, becomes lost in the moral and spiritual conception." The second adjective πονηρός, emphatically placed, gives prominence to the ethical idea, especially if the better supported order of the Rec., ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ, be adopted.—R.]

According to the will of God and our Father.—It is best to connect this with the whole of ver. 4. It refers the redeeming work as a whole to the gracious will of the Father, and thus cuts off every ground of objection against this work from the legal point of view. The thought of this redemptive counsel of the Father moves him very naturally, then, to the concluding doxology. — In τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ἡμῶν belongs probably only to πατρός. By θεός God is meant to be designated as the God of all alike; by πατήρ, according to His special relation to the Christian. By the prefixed article two predicates are ascribed to the same person. The same who is God is also our Father. [LIGHTFOOT argues from the absence of the article before πατρός, that ἡμῶν belongs to both nouns, but as ELLICOTT well remarks, "πατήρ is anarthrous according to rule." CALVIN, MEYER and most, restrict the pronoun to Father, giving the last words somewhat of a predicative force: "God, who is our Father." It is to be remarked that in vers. 1–3 Paul speaks of "God the Father," *i. e.*, the Father of Christ—but having in this verse spoken of the redemptive act of Christ, and its redeeming design for us he calls God, who has purposed this "our Father."—WORDSWORTH: "Specially our *Father* by the redemption of us His *children* by the blood of His *Son*."—R.]

Ver. 5. **To whom be glory.**—To be taken as optative; for δόξα means Honor, Praise—not Essential Glory, although it is true that the δόξα which should be given to God, rests upon the δόξα which He has. [SCHAFF: "The doxology in this place is likewise an indirect reproof of the Galatians for dividing the glory of our salvation between God and man." It is an affirmation rather than a wish. There can be no reasonable doubt that τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων here is an expression for eternity.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The Apostolate.* a. An essential characteristic of the apostolate was the immediate "call" through Christ, as whose "delegates" the apostles went out into the world with that proclamation of the Gospel, which should lay the foundation of all that followed. Hence the express assertion here (and afterwards the detailed proof) of this immediate calling. For this, if for no other reason, the

office of the Apostles was specifically distinct from all others.* In the office of preacher in these days, there always occurs a "call" δι' ἀνθρώπου. The office, however, is not on this account ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, nor should any bearer of it thus regard it. It is on the contrary "from" "Jesus Christ and God the Father," is *divina institutio*.

b. In the decision and certainty with which Paul insists upon his apostolic rank, there is implied, on the one hand, a justifiable sense of personal dignity in opposition to all who would question it, and especially to false teachers: "I am an Apostle and nothing less." This personal feeling, however, was certainly counterpoised at once, by the feeling of humility in view of the momentous duties involved, for the discharge of which grace alone could give strength. But, above all, the Apostle lays stress on this his dignity, not in his personal interest, but in the interest of his Lord, and the gospel of his Lord; in order to shield this against the "perverting" (ver. 7) of the false teachers, he is forced to lay this emphasis on the fact that he is really an Apostle of Christ, and therefore was such in his preaching of the gospel.

c. The care with which he proves his fundamental authority and capacity for preaching the gospel, is a pledge to us of the soundness of this preaching. The Christian church has, therefore, in this foundation laid by the Apostle, a standard for all time by which to prove doctrine.

d. That Christ has been raised, and now lives, is the fundamental truth, which to the Apostle stands immovably firm, and on which rests, for Paul, the certainty of his calling, and for him and the other Apostles the vigor and joyfulness of their labor in their vocation. For the Apostles were in a special sense to be witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus, and to be persuaded of it by a personal beholding of the Risen One. It was only because the risen Jesus had appeared to him, that Paul was an Apostle.

2. *The brethren.* This strong emphasizing of his particular vocation (or office) does not imply the least prejudice to his brotherly relation toward other Christians, who have no such vocation. Far from it. Paul not only mentions them in immediate connection with himself, including himself and them in the same salutation, but even treats them as fellow-writers, hence as those who, together with him, impart instruction and admonition, thus strengthening the weight of his own words by their concurrence. He is only called to preach what, as the substance of his faith, is the substance of theirs also; and he wishes to bring back his erring readers to the same faith in which these, his companions, stand and have remained firm. [Their concurrence could add nothing to the real authority of his apostolic teaching, but might aid in establishing that authority among the Galatians. Yet the Apostle seems fond of thus associating others of lower rank with himself in his Epistles.—R.] Here is a hint for the behavior of office-bearers towards other Christians now as well; in personal conduct, to regard and treat them as "brethren," standing on precisely the same footing; to lay claim to no precedence; and in official activity also, while maintaining full consciousness of their own special vocation, and of the authority inherent in it, never to ignore the might which dwells in the personal faith and believing life of the members of the Church, when there is an opportunity of joining them with one's self in exhortation and rebuke.

3. "*Churches*" *still.* Paul, it is true, gives to the Galatian Christians no especial title of honor, "yet he still counts them worthy to be called churches, because, though they were indeed for the most part fallen from the truth in some main points, they had, notwithstanding this, retained many parts of the pure Christian doctrine; he cherishes then the hope that they would still suffer themselves to be brought right again" (STARKE). Hence important doctrinal and ethical defects of a church do not of themselves warrant us in withholding or withdrawing from it the predicate ἐκκλησία. A judgment, whether in any place there is the Church of Christ or not, depends, although largely, yet not in the chief degree, upon subjective character, but in the chief degree stand the objective factors, namely, that *verbum divinum recte docetur*, and *sacramenta recte administrantur*. This, as is well known, is one of Luther's prime principles. In the objective factors, there certainly resides the power (even if latent) to work subjectively.—Yet it cannot therefore be denied that there may be, notwithstanding, a subjective character of the congregation as respects doctrine and morals, where the predicate ἐκκλησία ceases to be applicable; we cannot, however, pronounce a judgment thereon, but must leave this to the searcher of hearts, so far as it is not a question of *scandalous* offences in the case of individuals.

4. *God and Christ.* Both in ver. 1 and in ver. 3, Christ is placed in the closest connection with God the Father; and in ver. 3 in such a way that Grace and Peace are invoked in the same manner from God the Father, and from Christ. From this appears, in immediate certainty, the eminent, godlike position of Christ. For the highest and best things, those which are needful for all men, proceed from Him, as much as from the Father. As respects grace, as much depends on His dispositions towards us, as on those of the Father. As

* It is one of the anti-scriptural fancies of the Irvingites to believe, notwithstanding this, in the reappearance of Apostles proper in their churches. WIESELER. [In LIGHTFOOT, p. 92 sq., there is an interesting discussion on "the name and office of an Apostle." He, however, objects to the restriction of the office to the twelve, with only the exception of St. Paul, adducing the apostleship of Barnabas, and implying that "James, the Lord's brother" (ver. 19) was an Apostle, even though not the same as James, the son of Alpheus. This position is not safe, nor is it accordant with the argument of Paul in this Epistle, where he lays so much stress upon the "immediate call." Lightfoot is forced, therefore, to deny the necessity for a call from an outward personal communication with our Lord, though his admission that the having seen Christ was a necessary qualification, is a denial of the perpetuation of the office. It is better to hold that there were but Twelve Apostles, to whom was added, by direct call, Paul the Apostle to the Gentiles—Barnabas and others were "apostolic men." On the relation of Paul to the original *college of apostles*, see SCHAFF, *History of the Apostolic Church*, p. 512 sq., p. 233 sq. His note p. 234 is appropriate here: "The strict hierarchical view, which always looks for an outward, palpable succession, admits no satisfactory explanation of the fact, that the *Apostles* had no share whatever in the ordination of Paul after his conversion (Acts ix. 17), and in his being sent to the Gentiles by the Church of Antioch (xiii. 3). The divine irregularity of his call, and the subsequent independence of his labors, make Paul, so to speak, a prototype of evangelical Protestantism, which has always looked to him as its main authority, as Romanism to Peter."—R.]

Christ is thus placed with the Father on one Divine level, so is the Father, on the other side, placed on the same level with the Son, who, through His Incarnation, has drawn so near to us. LUTHER: "Therefore Paul, in wishing grace and peace not only from God the Father, but also from Jesus Christ, teacheth, first, that we should abstain from the curious searching of the Divine Majesty (for God no man knoweth), and hear Christ, who is in the bosom of the Father, and uttereth to us His will."

5. *Christ's giving Himself.* The expression for the death of Christ is here (ver. 4) so chosen, that it appears as His own free act, while, as is known, there runs parallel to the series of passages which apprehend it thus, another representing it as something decreed by God concerning Christ, representing Christ as burdened with the Father's curse (comp. iii. 13). This designation is here chosen, in order to render prominent and bring home to the hearts of the Galatians the great love of Christ, displayed in His "giving Himself for us." "The giving of Himself consisted of many actions, from the incarnation on, but it applies especially to his atoning death." This "giving Himself"—this morally great act was occasioned by our sins, our moral perversion; a cutting contrast, and yet a necessary nexus between cause and effect!—For its intent was to procure a remedy for our sins, and their ruinous results.

6. *This present evil world.* Through our sins we belong to this present evil world, bear its character, and are in its power, that is, through it and with it are going to destruction. From this destroying might Christ would rescue us, and has rescued us, by His giving Himself for our sins, that is, through the reconciliation thus accomplished for our sins; because we, when reconciled, lie no longer under the judgment of God upon the sinful world, and therefore do not go with it to ruin. Undoubtedly Christ had in view besides, an inward, moral deliverance from the corrupt course of the world; yet this is the secondary aim; the primary is the deliverance from judgment and perdition.—God's acts of grace, according to the Biblical view, are throughout directed, first of all, toward a deliverance from destruction, and consequently to the impartation of a good, of a definite happy destiny, not chiefly to the rehabilitation of certain ethical qualities, of a particular direction of life and will. They are directed thus, in a certain measure, towards an outward end, with which however an inward one is inseparably connected, as the economy of the Spirit, whose work it is to bring forth the corresponding ethical quality, is, although inseparable from that of the Father and the Son, yet distinct from it, presupposing it. The deliverance from the evil world, is, so far as concerns its being won, already accomplished by the sacrifice of Christ. Of course a participation in this is only gained through faith (this is implied in ἡμᾶς, which refers to believers), and is actually perfected only on the coming in of the *αἰὼν μέλλων*. A certain pledge and a joyful foretaste of it, however, the believer has already in justification, because this is an assurance of the divine grace. As to the rest, the apostolical expectation of the *αἰὼν μέλλων* as near lies at the foundation of this passage. [Whatever indications there may be elsewhere of "this apostolical expectation," neither the words nor context show any trace of it here, except on the view of MEYER, which refers "present evil world" to the times of danger immediately preceding the second coming of Christ, a view which is not adopted by Schmoller himself, nor by any other commentator of note.—R.]

7. *Redemption according to God's will.* The work of redemption was accomplished "according to the will" of the Father. This indicates the other side in the redeeming work, alluded to under 6, namely, that the death of Christ was also decreed to Him, by God for an expiation, and that Christ's "giving Himself" was accordingly, at the same time an act of obedience to the Father's will, a suffering Himself to be given up. Love to man and obedience to the Father, all in one, was the source of His sacrifice of Himself. This view is in full harmony with the declarations of Christ Himself, especially in John, with the emphasis which He lays on His having been sent, on His doing the will of the Father. There was nothing whatever self-elected in the redeeming work of Christ; it was a God-appointed work.—In this it first finds its firm, immovable foundation, and all scruples as to the availing worth of this self-sacrifice of Christ before God are taken away from the troubled conscience. At the same time, all clinging to such scruples is also condemned, as a striving against the will of God. We *may*, but we also *ought* to believe in the atoning death of Christ; hence especially, we ought not to lessen its significance by a righteousness of works. This will of God is the will that we should be saved, according to which, He willed both the way that should lead to our salvation, Christ's dying on account of our sins, and also the result, our redemption. It was a loving will, but also a will of holy love, condemning sin and forgiving it; the latter only on the foundation of the former, but the former also for the sake of the latter. Because aiming at our salvation it was in any case the will of God our *Father*.

8. *God's honor its end.* As and because the will of God is the origin of the work of redemption, so the honor of God is its aim. That He, His name, be honored, is the purpose and result of redemption. To Him belongeth honor—and that honor forever—for redemption, and such honor will be rendered Him by the Redeemed. The phrase *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶν. τ. αἰών.* no doubt looks forward to the *αἰὼν μέλλων*. The expression is, however, thus indefinitely framed, in order, as far as the language admits, to express an eternal duration. There is nothing in this, of course, against the division found elsewhere, into simply two æons, present and future.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. STARKE:—To all peculiarly spiritual offices belongs a divine vocation. Every man may take comfort in the consciousness of his office and calling, and also appeal to it when there is need. Let no one deem this pride or boasting. —SPENER:—Christ is the founder of the preacher's office. He is the King in His Kingdom, and so sends whom He will. He is the Chief Shep-

herd, and therefore all under shepherds must be appointed by Him. He has obtained by His merits the spiritual power needed for the ministry, and has received the Holy Ghost to that end for our sakes. It is He, therefore, who speaks through His servants.—LUTHER:—Wert thou wiser than Solomon and Daniel, yet until thou art called, flee the sacred ministry, as thou wouldst hell and the devil, then wilt thou not spill the word of God to no purpose. If God needs thee, He will know how to call thee. — LANGE:—To be sure of one's divine, although only mediate vocation, is a weighty matter, and gives to the conscience rest, in the office blessing, and to vindication of the same and of the pure doctrine, much joyfulness. —WÜRT. SUMM.:—There is a twofold vocation to the ministry; both are of God, who will have the gospel preached to the end of the world; but some are called of God without means, of which sort are the patriarchs, prophets, apostles; and some through men, although according to God's commandment and ordinance. — RIEGER: — As certainly as every believer shall be taught of God, so that what he has apprehended from human instruction is confirmed in his heart with divine impressions and powerful workings, just so certainly must every teacher have in his conscience a divine seal upon his vocation, although derived through men, and on this account a joyfulness which his hearers cannot impeach.

The apostolate in its high significance; 1. for the founding, 2. for the continuance of the Christian church which must perpetually rest upon the foundation of the apostolic doctrine.—The divine vocation to office: I. To have it, is under all circumstances needful; 2. To be certain of it, is often important; 3. To appeal to it, may often be right and proper.—How independent (of men), and yet at the same time, how dependent (on God), the preacher of the gospel is and knows himself (may and should know himself) to be!—Even so the Christian generally: he is what he is, not from men (although through men), for not natural descent nor outward fellowship makes him such — but through Jesus Christ and God the Father.—Christian sense of personal worth: 1. its justification, 2. its limits.—All through Jesus Christ! *a*) humbling truth—not through us; *b*) exalting truth — through no less a one than Christ, and thereby through the Highest, God.—[CALVIN:—In the church we ought to listen to God alone, and to Jesus Christ, whom He has appointed to be our teacher. Whoever assumes a right to instruct us, must speak in the name of God or of Christ.—BURKITT:—Behold the peculiar prerogative of St. Paul above the rest of the Apostles; they were called by Christ in the day of His humiliation; but he was called by Christ when sitting at His Father's right hand in heaven. As his call was thus very extraordinary, so his gifts were answerable to his call.—R.]

Ver. 2. WÜRT. SUMM.:—Although the truth of a doctrine does not rest upon the multitude of people, but alone upon God's word, yet, when many support a doctrine founded in God's word, the weak in the faith are noticeably strengthened thereby, because they see that not merely one or two, but many, confess such a doctrine.—SPENER: — Christians are "brethren" to each other; for they have one Heavenly Father, one first-born brother, Christ; one mother, the Christian church; one seed of regeneration, the divine word; one inheritance of eternal life. That is a more intimate and strict brotherhood than the common one among all men.—STARKE:—In names and titles we must give good heed not willingly to commit falsehood, nor attribute to any one, praise that does not belong to him; yet common and authorized titles must be understood not in absolute strictness, but according to common use. —SPENER:—There remains even in a loose crowd a Christian church, even though grave errors, which remove the ground of faith are found there, so long as God's word and the holy sacraments are there and are maintained.

On Vers. 1 and 2. Let us hear, when we begin to waver in the truth: 1. Apostolic doctrine; 2. The testimony of brethren!—Apostolic doctrine and the voice of brethren; an admonition to every church to abide in the evangelical truth.

Ver. 3. RIEGER:—Paul flees in this perplexity to the riches of God in Christ Jesus, and entrusts to the grace and the peace from thence, the restoration of the Galatians also; with this greeting, as with a cordial, he not only refreshes their hearts but quickens himself also to a confidence towards God in Christ. — WÜRT. SUMM.: — We see here where we must begin, when after sin committed we will come to God for grace; namely, not with ourselves, not with our piety! for if we had kept this, we should be already in favor with God, nor even with God Himself out of Christ, for He is to sinners a consuming fire, but alone with Christ, and His bitter passion and death for our sins.—LUTHER: — Paul wishes the Galatians grace and peace, not from the emperor or kings and princes; for these are wont ofttimes to persecute the godly: nor does he wish them grace and peace from the world, for in the world they shall have tribulation; but from God our Father, that is, he wishes them a godly and heavenly peace. —LANGE:—True peace can never exist without grace, for grace is the ground and source of peace; on the other hand there is grace sometimes without peace, especially with the tempted, who may, for awhile fall into great disquietness of soul, and yet remain in God's grace.

Ver. 4. STARKE:—If Christ has for our sakes given His all, ah! should not we surrender ourselves, with all that in us is, to Him? Man! keep thyself from sin, on account of which Christ hath endured so much, lest thou thyself bring to nought for Him this great work, for which He came. — LUTHER:—Mark diligently the word: "for *our*." For therein lies all the virtue, namely, that all which is said concerning us in the Holy Scriptures, in such passages as "for me," "for us," "for our sin," and the like, we should know how to take well in mind, and apply particularly to ourselves, and hold fast thereto by faith. — For thou hast, no doubt, easily brought thyself to believe that Christ, God's Son, was given for St. Peter's, St. Paul's, and other saints' sins, who were worthy of such grace; but, contrariwise it is especially and thoroughly hard, that thou, for thine own person, a poor, unworthy, condemned sinner, shouldst from thine heart certainly believe, hold, and

say, that Christ, God's Son was given for thy so many and so great sins, who yet nevertheless hast never yet been worthy of such grace.—Therefore should we well train and prepare our hearts with this utterance and the like utterances of St. Paul, that when the devil hereafter comes and accuses us and says: "See, you are a sinner, therefore you must be damned!" we may meet him and answer, "yea, good devil, for the very reason that you accuse me and will be condemning me for a sinner, for that reason will I be righteous and holy, be not damned, but saved the rather. For in this very thing, that you tell me how I am a poor sinner, and a great one, you give me a sword and weapon in hand wherewith I can mightily overcome you, yea, slay you and put you under my feet with your own arms. For if you can tell me that I am a poor sinner, I can say to you again, that Christ died for sinners."–Count these words of St. Paul as said in earnest, and to be true, and not as a dream, when he says that the world is evil, although many people therein have many noble, beautiful, virtues; and although in outward guise and appearance there is much holiness and brilliant excellence.—To this evil world belongs also all art, wisdom, righteousness, &c., of a godless man. Thy wisdom, which thou hast out of Christ, is a double folly, thy righteousness is a double sin and godlessness, since it knows nothing of the wisdom and righteousness of Christ, and since, over and above this, it darkens, hinders, reviles and persecutes you; wherefore St. Paul may well name the world an evil world; for it is the worst when it will be at the best and most pious. In the religious, wise and learned men, it will be at its most pious and best, and yet it is twice as wicked.

Berlenb. Bible:—Of this present evil world, ordinances of religion form no small part, of which much is instituted whereby men will take one another captive to the spirit of the world. Without religion nevertheless will the world not be; so it dresses up such things as may be congruous with flesh and blood; but true religion burdens and depresses it. Thus the deliverance takes place especially from the Pharisaic leaven.—Starke:—See how availing and certain is our redemption and salvation, because it proceeds from the will of the Father: how can that be unavailing, which has come to pass according to His will.—[Schaff:—God is *our* Father because He is the Father (not simply of Jesus Christ which would place him on a par with us, but) of *our Lord* Jesus Christ.—R.]

Ver. 5. As often as we think on the great work of redemption, we should heartily praise God; and therefore should we often think thereon; that we may be powerfully excited to praise.—To praise God is the best divine service; it is that which must endure unto eternity. Happy he who begins it here, and prepares himself thereby for a blessed eternity. It is a proof that he knows God aright, and has become partaker of His grace, and that he will one day come to the heavenly choirs of angels who praise God.

Jesus' giving Himself to death: 1. Its occasion (our sins); 2. Its purpose (our deliverance therefrom); or: 1. the strongest testimony against us (our sin); 2. the mightiest consolation for us; or: 1. Its great effect (to deliver us from this evil world); 2. Whence it has this effect (as being a satisfying and bearing and thereby a taking away of the divine wrath; 3. in whom it is thus effectual (only in those who are His in faith).—What defends us from being lost with this evil world? 1. Not our own righteousness whereby we only entangle ourselves in this evil world the more, but 2. Christ's sacrificial death alone.—The appropriation of the merits of Christ: 1. Every one needs it on account of his sins; 2. The sinner needs it precisely as sinner.—Jesus Christ the Deliverer out of the power of this present evil world: 1. The world the tyrant in whose power we are; 2. Christ the Deliverer that has appeared.—Evil—the character of this world: 1. Therefore the Christian in this world longs for the world to come; 2. He must however be delivered from this present world, in order to enter the world to come.—Redemption through Christ rests upon the will of God: 1. A rich consolation (against all doubts); 2. An earnest admonition: Whoever lightly esteems the redemption accomplished through Christ, sins thereby against the will of God Himself.—The honor which is due to God for the redemption in Christ.—The praise of God: 1. a fruit of the redeemed state; 2. a proof of the same.—The praise which the redeemed bring to God: 1. begins in time; 2. continues into eternity.

Vers. 3–5. Lisco:—The Apostle's invocation of blessings for his churches: 1. What does it contain? The greatest benefits which are bestowed by God on man. 2. On what is this invocation grounded? a. On the free will offering of Christ. b. On the gracious counsel of God, to redeem us by such offering.—The benediction of the Apostle: 1. A proof his hearty love: even to the unthankful, who through their apostasy have so troubled him, he wishes the best things; 2. A proof of his standing fast in the truth: in direct opposition to them he held fast so much the more definitely the evangelical truth, of redemption through Christ's death alone, and points them to that in contrast with their erroneous opinions.—Right wishing: 1. wishes true benefits; 2. points to the true source of such benefits.—The right behavior toward those who are disposed to depart from the truth: to open the heart fully to them in expressions of desire, full of divine blessing, before closing with and combatting their errors.

Vers. 1–5. The appearance of the Apostle against the Galatians: 1. in the full dignity of his office, at the same time, however, associating the brethren with himself; 2. with the full love of his heart, at the same time conceding nothing of the truth.

Occasion of the Epistle: APOSTASY OF THE GALATIANS FROM THE GOSPEL, WHICH PAUL HAD PREACHED TO THEM, TO THE FALSE DOCTRINE OF CERTAIN SEDUCERS, AGAINST WHOM HE THEREFORE UTTERS THE ANATHEMA.

CHAPTER I. 6–10.

6 I marvel that ye are so soon removed [changing over][1] from him that called you
7 into [in or by][2] the grace of Christ[3] unto another [a different][4] gospel: Which is
not another; but there be [except that there are] some that trouble you, and would
8 [θέλοντες, wish to] pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from
heaven, preach [should preach][5] any other gospel unto you[6] than [or contrary to][7]
9 that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed [anathema]. As we
said before,[8] so say I now again, If any *man* preach any other gospel unto you than
10 [or contrary to] that ye have received, let him be accursed [anathema]. For do I
now persuade [am I now conciliating][9] men, or God? or do I seek to please men?
for [omit for][10] if I yet pleased men, I should not be the [a] servant of Christ.

1 Ver. 6.—[Μετατίθεσθε, middle, not passive, see EXEG. NOTES.—R.]
2 Ver. 6.—['Εν cannot mean "into," especially after καλέω.—R.]
3 Ver. 6.—[The many variations, such as the omission of Χρ., the insertion of 'Ιησοῦ, the substitution of θεοῦ, all probably sprang from mistaken exegesis, joining Χρ. with καλέσαντος. The reading Χριστοῦ is very well supported and now universally retained.—R.]
4 Ver. 6.—['Ετερον, "different in kind," not "another of the same kind" (ἄλλο, ver. 7). So Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth, Lightfoot.—R.]
5 Ver. 8.—[The periphrasis of the E. V. is necessary to bring out the force of εὐαγγελίζηται, in its reference to εὐαγγέλιον, vers. 6, 7; but the subjunctive must not be overlooked, as marking the different conditional propositions of vers. 8, 9.—R.]
6 Ver. 8.—ℵ. omits ὑμῖν, ℵ3. first adds it.
7 Ver. 8.—[On the meaning of παρά, here and ver. 9. See EXEG. NOTES.—R.]
8 Ver. 9.—ℵ1.: προειρηκα.
9 Ver. 10.—["Persuade" is obviously inapplicable to God. Πείθω here means "to conciliate," "to make friends of." So modern English commentators. The form: "am I," *etc.*, is required by the emphatic ἄρτι (Ellicott).—R.]
10 Ver. 10.—Rec. εἰ γὰρ ἔτι; but γάρ is best omitted. [Rejected on preponderant MSS. authority by all modern editors.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Without any thanksgiving for the readers' gifts of grace, as in other Epistles, the Apostle passes immediately from the invocation of a blessing to sharp rebuke which, however, strikes not so much the Galatians themselves as their seducing teaches. Vers. 6–9.

Ver. 6. **I marvel that ye are so soon changing over.**—He finds it strange, since he has expected, and had reason to expect, something different. "So soon" refers rather to the entrance of the apostasy than to its course, as having so rapidly developed itself from its commencement. The latter view suits the connection the less, inasmuch as μετατίθεσθε designates the apostasy as yet in process of development; οὕτω ταχέως, is therefore, we may say, equivalent to—so soon after the last visit of the Apostle. ["So soon" either 1) after conversion, or 2) after his visit, or 3) after the false teachers came; all three may be included, and are true; which is the primary reference cannot be *certainly* determined. In any case in view of the middle force of μετατίθεσθε ("turning renegades," LIGHTFOOT), it is a charge that the change was sudden and one for which they were to blame. SCHAFF: "The Greek implies first that the apostasy was voluntary, hence their own guilt; secondly, that it was not yet completed, and hence might be averted. The passive rendering would transfer the guilt to the false teachers."—R.]

From him that called you: most probably from God, who called you on the ground of the grace of Christ, which He has shown in His surrender of Himself to death; not=from Christ, who out of grace has called you. It is true that with the first explanation ἐν χάρ. Χρ. is difficult to render, but in any case it is not to be understood of the state of grace, as if=called you to the possession and enjoyment of grace.—[**By the grace of Christ.**—The E. V. renders ἐν χάριτι, "into the grace," following the Vulgate, but ἐν is here used in its instrumental sense. ALFORD: "Christ's grace is the elementary medium of our 'calling of God;' the sum of all that He has suffered and done for us to bring us to God; — *whereby* we come to the Father, — in which, as its element, the Father's calling of us has place." ELLICOTT: "The *dogmatical* consideration that the grace of Christ, in the sense it here appears used by St. Paul, denotes an active and energizing influence rather than a passive element, seems distinctly to suggest the instrumental sense." Comp. his notes *in loco*.—R.] But it is God Himself who "calls." The reference of καλέσαντος to the Apostle has some support in the fact that he afterwards opposes so expressly his own preaching to that of others, yet must

be rejected, as καλεῖν too constantly expresses an activity of God for this interpretation. The apostasy is described, doubtless not undesignedly, as an apostasy from a person, not from a doctrine, that it may appear as ingratitude.—**To a different gospel.** — More exactly: to another kind of gospel = εὐαγγ. παρ' ὃ παρελ. (ver. 9). A *gospel*, either because the Galatians naturally took the doctrine which the false teachers brought them for the Gospel, or primarily in the general sense of Doctrine of Salvation, which the legal doctrine also claimed to be.

Ver. 7. Yet Paul as it were at once corrects himself, and respecting that which he has just named "gospel," denies again that this predicate in fact belongs to it, this false teaching is no gospel, but a subversion of the gospel. This is at all events the sense, if ὃ — the most obvious construction — is referred to the immediately preceding εὐαγγ. = "which other sort of gospel is no other, by the side of that preached by me, except that there are," *etc.* [The more correct reference is to ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον. So MEYER, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, LIGHTFOOT, and Schmoller himself. See ALFORD'S notes *in loco* for a full discussion and objections to the reference below. —R.] The reference however to the whole sentence is possible=which is nothing else (that is, this turning to another gospel) than that you have let yourselves be seduced by such as wish to subvert the gospel.

There be some that trouble you.—"Paul is fond of calling his opposers: τινές, *i. e.*, certain well known people, whom one for any reason whatever, in this case out of disparagement, will not designate more nearly." WIESELER.—[WORDSWORTH suggests and defends an ironical meaning: "unless they who are troubling you, are somebody," but this seems forced. LIGHTFOOT paraphrases well: "only in this sense is it another gospel, in that it is an attempt to pervert the one true gospel."—R.] — Ταράσσειν = to disturb the conscience and thereby the feelings by exciting doubts whether the gospel preached to them were the true teaching or not.—**Wish to pervert** = to have the will, to labor for; as the sequel plainly shows, it has not yet come to an actual perversion; μεταστρέφειν= הָפַךְ, *funditus evertere.*—**The gospel of Christ,** probably=gospel respecting Christ, inasmuch as in the first place the gospel treats of Christ generally; especially, however, because the merit of Christ is the chief theme of the true gospel in distinction from the legal teaching. The gospel, of course, could not, in itself, be destroyed, but the evangelical preaching among the Galatians might be, if they received another teaching.

Ver. 8. **But though we—let him be anathema.**—Certain persons wish to destroy the gospel of Christ among you, and bring you another, but (ἀλλά) rather let every one who does that be ἀνάθεμα, instead of passing for an evangelist.—Ἡμεῖς: first and chiefly the Apostle himself, then, however, also the "brethren who are with me," in whose name he likewise writes.—**Angel from heaven**, to be taken together=angel descended from heaven. "If Paul repudiates his own and even angelic authority in the case assumed, as accursed, then every one, without exception (comp. ὅστις ἂν ᾖ, v. 10), is subject to the same curse in the same case." MEYER. — Παρ' ὃ εὐηγγ. ὑμῖν=literally: beyond that, *etc.*, may be equivalent to *præterquam*, or to *contra.* "Formerly dogmatic interest came here into play, the Lutherans, in opposition to tradition, contending for *præterquam*, and the Catholics in defence of it, for *contra. Contra*, or more exactly the sense of specific difference, is according to the context the right sense. (See ver. 6. ἕτερον.)" MEYER. [This sense of παρά, "contrary to," is now generally conceded by Protestant commentators. WORDSWORTH and LIGHTFOOT give it the sense of "besides;" the latter arguing from the context that Paul means, his gospel will brook no rival, will suffer no foreign admixture, but, as ELLICOTT remarks: "the Apostle implies throughout the Epistle that the Judaical gospel was in the strict sense of the words an ἕτερον εὐαγγ., and in its very essence opposed to the true gospel." Both ideas may properly be included (ALFORD, SCHAFF).—R.]—Εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν: namely, I and my companions at the time of your conversion. Comp. παρελάβ. ver. 9.

Let him be anathema. — A translation of חֵרֶם = Dedicated to God without ransom=given over to annihilation, to death, in the Old Testament to bodily, in the New Testament to θάνατος in opposition to ζωή, to eternal death. See in WIESELER a detailed elucidation and refutation of the explanation, "excommunicated." [Ἀνάθεμα is the common Hellenistic form of the classical and Attic word ἀνάθημα, which in both forms originally meant "devoted to God." When the two forms were desynonymized, the Hellenistic word naturally took a meaning from the Hebrew (through the LXX.) *in malam partem*, while the Attic form was used in a good sense. Comp. Luke xxi. 5, where only it is found in N. T. This distinction was general, but not universal. Afterwards the common patristic sense of our word undoubtedly was "excommunicated," though sometimes accompanied with distinct execration. It cannot have this meaning here, for "an angel from heaven" is not open to excommunication, nor does N. T. usage favor such a signification. Comp. Rom. ix. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 3. See also TRENCH, *Syn. N. T.* § 5, MEYER, ELLICOTT, LIGHTFOOT.—This passage affords no warrant for ecclesiastical anathemas. Such a practice presupposes the milder meaning, which is incorrect, and as milder, in itself forbids such anathematizing. It is obviously unfair to find in St. Paul's language first, a reason for ecclesiastical "excommunication," and then a warrant for "anathematizing."—R.]

Ver. 9. **As we said before.**—Referring probably to his last visit, not to ver. 8.—The Apostle repeats the curse, which he has pronounced ver. 8, in order to show that he "speaks deliberately." BENGEL. — [Notice that in ver. 8 the Apostle uses ἐάν with the subjunctive: "though we, or an angel, should preach," in ver. 9, εἰ with the indicative: "if any man preach," appending the anathema in both cases. "In the former, a pure hypothesis is put forward, in itself highly improbable; in the latter a fact which had actually occurred and was occurring" (LIGHTFOOT). There is additional force in the change of subject: even Paul or an angel from heaven — did they do so — would be

anathema, much more—any man, neither Apostle nor angel—is anathema, having done so.—R.]

Ver. 10. **For am I now conciliating men?**—Explanation (γάρ) of the severity with which he demeans himself towards the false teachers by this repeated *ἀνάθεμα*. He does it, because he is concerned only for the favor of God, not that of men. It would be natural to understand "now" like ver. 9 of the time of the composition of the epistle. Yet on the other hand this limitation is not quite congruous to the general contents of the verse, it is therefore better to understand it more generally of the time of the Apostle's conversion. [It seems more natural to regard "now" as an emphatic taking up of "now" in ver. 9—"now in what I have said." Paul had not been a man-pleaser before conversion. If he had been charged with it among the Galatians, he was not so NOW in what he had been writing.—R.]—Πείθειν=to win over, to draw to one's side by persuasion, whether directly by words or otherwise; here, in view of the reference to God=to gain for one's self, to win for one's self as a friend.—'Αρέσκειν: sometimes to please, sometimes to be disposed to please, to live according to the pleasure of; the latter here. "Yet" goes back to the same time with "now." ["Yet," *i. e.*, after my call to the apostleship, and all that has happened to me (SCHAFF). "It is equivalent to 'at this stage, at this late date'" (LIGHTFOOT).—R.]—**I should not be a servant of Christ**=could make no claim to this title. As a true servant of Christ, who dares not act to please men, I must, even though it should not please men, judge with all sharpness and severity respecting those who subvert the gospel. "Servant of Christ" is here doubtless to be taken in its official sense=could make no claim to the name of a teacher. With how much right Paul could say so of himself is shown, *e. g.*, by 2 Cor. xi. 23 sq.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Apostasy even in the early church.* The glimpse of such scenes of the first Christian Church as our Epistle speaks of, and as are mentioned by anticipation in our section, is instructive. Even in such as had been brought to the faith by a Paul himself, a speedy lapse was possible, and yet he certainly fulfilled his office among them in the right way, and his activity was blessed. Even the best preaching cannot overcome the sinful nature of the human heart. This preserving and making steadfast in the truth, is a work of the Holy Ghost, and it goes on, just as growth is wont to do: through advances and fallings back on account of the opposing might of the flesh, according to the account of the Apostle himself. Chap. v. 17.

2. *The false teachers.* Deflections from evangelical truth, however, are not on this account to be taken lightly; but on the contrary, very gravely, as the language of the Apostle in this passage shows. Paul had full justification in uttering a curse against the false teachers, and thus giving them over to everlasting destruction, in the wickedness they committed with their false teaching; which was a double one—1) against persons: they perplexed their consciences and brought them in danger of losing the salvation of their souls; 2) against the cause: they went about to subvert the gospel of Christ. They made an attack on the sacred rights of believers, and their conduct was therefore worthy of a curse. That this curse does not flow from personal mortification, because they had rejected his teaching, Paul shows plainly by placing himself under the curse, in case he should teach differently. Besides, the anathema is, of course, aimed at this conduct of the false teachers in itself, and this sharp opposition by no means excluded the wish that they might themselves see the error of their way, and themselves come to the knowledge of the evangelical truth. But this was not the place for saying this. He expresses himself with thorough earnestness against the false teachers, only to open the eyes of the Galatians, and to release them from the snares in which they had allowed themselves to be taken. Although in this earnestness he comes in conflict with men, he must do what beseems a servant of Christ: be zealous for Christ and the salvation of His people.

3. *Pleasing men.* What Paul says, ver. 10, appears to be opposite to 1 Cor. x. 33; but in 1 Cor. Paul speaks of things indifferent, in which a man may yield somewhat without wounding his conscience (comp. Rom. xv. 2). Here, however, he means sinful complaisance, where one fashions his doctrine and preaching according to the sense of men, in order thus to gain their favor. He only then is a servant of Christ, who subordinates unconditionally the favor of men to the favor of God, who in His official activity does not seek to make Himself pleasing to men, does not make this his object. When, however, from time to time—for uninterrupted it can never be—the favor of men falls to his lot, he is to receive it from God's hand with thankfulness and humility, as a kind indulgence, which in his manifold conflicts may be of value. That the servant of Christ must be on his guard, not to draw upon himself deservedly the ill-will of the world through pride and self-will; that he is not in carnal temper to fly in the face of men, and hence that he must always examine well whether his zeal is a spiritual one, or is not becoming a carnal one, if it were not such from the beginning, is indeed self-evident, but cannot be carefully enough considered; as in general the theory of the relation of human and divine favor is tolerably simple, but the practice is very difficult.

[4. WORDSWORTH:—Not to please men, be they never so many or great, out of flatness of spirit, so as, for the pleasing of them, either

1) To neglect any part of our duty towards God and Christ; or,
2) To go against our own consciences, by doing any dishonest or unlawful thing; or,
3) To do them harm whom we would please, by confirming them in their errors, flattering them in their sins, humoring them in their peevishness, or but even cherishing their weakness; for weakness, though it may be borne with, yet it must not be cherished.

But then, by yielding to their infirmities for a time, in hope to win them, by patiently expecting their conversion or strengthening, by restoring them with the spirit of meekness, with meek-

ness instructing them that oppose themselves, should we seek to please all men.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. "I marvel:"—is a word of apostolic wisdom.—LUTHER:—St. Paul does not set upon the Galatians with vehement and terrifying words, but speaks in quite fatherly and friendly wise with them; and does not only soften down their fall and error, but excuses them also in a manner, yet so that he nevertheless also punishes them. Therefore, of all sweet and mild words, he could hardly have chosen one more fit than when he says, "I marvel."—RIEGER:—In itself the preservation and perseverance of a man in good is more to be wondered at than when there is a stumbling or falling. But the Apostle says, "I marvel," in order to express to them thereby the confidence of something better, which he has retained on their behalf, and to let them discover something of the hope, in which he stands, of begetting them again through the gospel unto their first faith.

WÜRT. SUMM.:—We are here reminded of our human weakness. We should endeavor to be so assured of divine truth in our own heart, as to be able to persevere therein, though even an angel would persuade us of something else, and the whole world would believe otherwise. Such perseverance is not in our power, however, but must be obtained from God through prayer and through diligent use of the divine word, which alone can make our walk steadfast.

"From him that called you by the grace of Christ unto another gospel."—RIEGER:—A tender description of the good work begun in them. A feeling contrast with the yoke which some would now lay upon their necks.—SPENER:—Whosoever will no longer be saved simply through the grace of God in Christ falls away from the Father and the grace of Christ to another gospel, even though he holds the other articles of faith. For so soon as merit is mixed therewith, it is no more grace.

Apostasy from the truth: 1. how far not to be wondered at; 2. how far to be wondered at. —So soon alienated! 1. a word of grief, true of so many; 2. a warning word, in relation to all.—An apostatizing tendency, or inconstancy a radical fault of the human heart: 1. sluggish and immovable, where it is of moment that it should move and apply itself; 2. so movable and unsteady where it should abide firm.—To turn ourselves from Him who hath called us: 1. so lightly done; 2. weighs yet so heavily.—Another Gospel! is the world's cry; no other! must forever remain our answering testimony.

Ver. 7. SPENER:—The gospel of Christ will not let itself be mixed with the doctrine of works, as if these were necessary to salvation; but as soon as this is done, the gospel is perverted.—HEDINGER:—More taught than God has thought, is to the gospel quite athwart. The false teachers will have Christ's grace, to be sure, but something of their own works therewith. Gross error! Adding more destroys the store.—STARKE:—Where Satan cannot persuade men to open sins, he seeks to perplex their consciences, and pervert the gospel, which is the only means of salvation; in this too he very easily succeeds, because the doctrine of works appears quite agreeable to the reason.

Ver. 8. LUTHER:—It is not in vain that St. Paul sets himself first, and will, first of all, be accursed, if he shows himself herein worthy of it. For all excellent workmen are wont also thus to do, namely, to reprehend their own faults first, for then can they so much the more freely chide and censure the faults of others.—SPENER:—No creature has authority to change anything in the gospel, or to add thereto, of however eminent rank, office, enlightenment, holiness, and miraculous power he may be. Not even the whole Church, nor her teachers, nor her councils and the like. If the change is made, no inquiry is needed; but it is to be reprobated, because it is new and another.—LANGE:—As the blessing coming out of the gospel is the most weighty and noble of all, so is the curse which rests upon the hindering of the blessing through falsifying the gospel, the greatest of all, one which remains forever upon soul and body.

Ver. 10. LUTHER:—We cannot more hotly and bitterly anger the world than by attacking and condemning her wisdom, righteousness, ability, and powers. If we now reject and condemn these highest gifts of the world, that is truly not to behave feigningly to the world, but to strive after hate and ill luck, and, moreover, to get both our hands full of the same. For if we condemn men with all their doings, it can never fail but that we must soon take our chance and bring upon ourselves such scorn and envy that we shall be persecuted, hunted, banished, condemned, and, very likely, even murdered.—SPENER:—The sincerity of a teacher, when men see that his concern is alone to please God, and not men, is a strong ground for believing that his teaching is sound and pure.—HEDINGER:—Just so! Whoever in the church, in the state, in the family, serves men, fears and cowers before men, and, for their sake, bends the right, flatters and fawns, has trifled away his best title—Christ's servant and disciple. A thunder-stroke! Whose ears tingle not, when he hears it?—RIEGER:—O God! preserve all thy servants, that no one, through pride and self-will, may draw persecution upon himself, and fly in the faces of men; but grant also that we may not count persecution, mocking, and contempt as tokens of our having betrayed the truth, but may view them and bear them as the marks in the foreheads of thine approved servants!

The earnestness with which Paul opposes the false teachers: 1. well founded, 2. very significant for us: should (a) withhold us from the reception of any unevangelical doctrine; (b) strengthen us in the certainty that the gospel, which we have, is the true one.—A curse upon him who preaches a false doctrine! 1. A fearfully earnest utterance; 2. yet pressingly needful; 3. instructive for all that are wavering.—Let not every man undertake to be a teacher, but whoever is, let him take heed what he teaches.—The curse which Paul pronounces upon himself, if he should preach another gospel, is a token: 1. how high the gospel stands in his view; 2. how humbly he thinks of himself (viewing himself only as a mere instrument,

as a servant, who has to accomplish what his Master has commanded him).—Not the Church above the word, but the word above the Church!—Two earnest questions: 1. Which seekest thou most, man's favor or God's favor? 2. Which is weightier, man's favor or God's favor?—Man's favor or God's favor? Choose: there is no third.—The right union of unsparingness and forbearance in our intercourse with men: an art of difficult attainment.—To be entirely unsparing, and entirely forbearing, each in the right way, is the Christian's duty in dealing with men.—Man's disfavor, compared with God's favor, as insignificant as wholesome, perfects us in humility, and impels us the more to assure ourselves of the favor of God.

On the whole section.—Lisco:—The curse of the Apostle against the false apostles: I. Whom it strikes: 1. Necessarily every one, without exception, who changes the blessing of the gospel into mischief, and so out of good prepares for himself death; 2. those also who have deep insight, or other high qualities for serving the kingdom of God, and yet do not preach it purely; 3. even an angel himself, if he could preach another gospel. II. Why must it be uttered? 1. He who preaches the gospel must have a will thereby to serve, not men, but God; 2. through a false gospel men may, indeed, be attracted, but God views it as blasphemy; 3. therefore, he is placed under the curse, who will serve the gospel, and yet doing so as a man-pleaser, is found an unfruitful servant of Christ.

The apostasy of believers: 1. is, alas, sometimes a fact; 2. from what does it proceed? 3. how is it to be remedied?—The Apostle's demeanor: 1. towards the misled: he makes a complaint and charge; but through it all the full tones of compassion and love are heard; 2. towards the misleaders: unsparingly stern even to denouncing a curse.—To fall away from the gospel is bad, but to subvert the gospel is worse.

I.

To destroy the influence which the false teachers had gained in the churches, Paul refutes their attacks upon his APOSTOLIC DIGNITY, and proves thereby the full authority of his preaching.

Chapter I. 11—II. 21.

1. To this end he appeals to the fact that he received his commission to declare the Gospel from God and Christ Himself through immediate revelation, not from the senior Apostles.

(Chap. i. 11–24.)

11 But I certify you [Now I declare unto you],[1] brethren, that the gospel which was
12 preached of [ὑπ', by] me is not after man. For I neither received [For neither did
I receive][2] it of [from] man, neither was I taught *it*, but by [through] the [omit the]
13 revelation of [from][3] Jesus Christ. For ye have [omit have] heard of my conversa-
tion in time past in the Jews' religion [Judaism],[4] how that beyond measure I per-
14 secuted the church of God and wasted [was destroying][5] it: And profited in the
Jews' religion above many my equals [And surpassed in Judaism many of my
age][6] in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my
15 fathers [or my ancestral traditions]. But when it pleased God,[7] who separated me
16 [set me apart][8] from my mother's womb, and called *me* by his grace, To reveal
his Son in [within] me, that I might preach him among the heathen [Gentiles];
17 immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: Neither went I up [away][9] to
Jerusalem to them which [who] were apostles before me; but I went [went away] into
18 Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to
Jerusalem to see Peter [to make the acquaintance of Cephas],[10] and abode with
19 him fifteen days. But other of the apostles saw I none [I did not see], save
20 James the Lord's brother. Now the things which I write unto you, behold, be-
21 fore God I lie not. Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia;
22 And [but] was unknown by face unto the churches of Judea which were in Christ:
23 But they had heard only [only they were hearing],[11] That he which persecuted us
in times past [who once persecuted us] now preacheth [is now preaching] the faith
24 which once he destroyed [was destroying]. And they glorified God in me.

[1] Ver. 11.—The *Recepta* γνωρίζω δέ is well attested, adopted by Lachmann and latterly by Tischendorf. [Alford retains γάρ on the authority of B. F. and a few others; δέ is adopted by Wordsworth, Ellicott and Lightfoot, on the authority of ℵ. A. D[23]. K. L. and most versions. "Now I declare unto you" is taken from E. V., 1 Cor. xv. 1, where the Greek is the same.—R.]

[2] Ver. 12.—[Ellicott's rendering given above, is an alteration made to retain the emphasis on "I," and to indicate that the first negative is not strictly correlative to the second. "From" instead of "of," in conformity with modern usage.—R.]

[3] Ver. 12.—[The genitive Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is a subjective genitive. See Exeg. Notes.—R.]

[4] Ver. 13.—[Ἰουδαϊσμῷ is better rendered literally. So in ver. 14.—R.]

[5] Ver. 13.—[The sense of the imperfect, ἐπόρθουν, is best expressed thus. Schaff renders: "labored to destroy." The same change in ver. 23.—R.]

[6] Ver. 14.—[Schaff thus renders it. The E. V. is unusually unsatisfactory here; the ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, συνηλικιώτας means "contemporaries."—R.]

[7] Ver. 15.—Ὁ Θεός of Rec. is rejected by Tischendorf, and bracketted by Lachmann. ℵ. has the words [so also A. D. K. L., many cursives and versions; retained by Ellicott, Wordsworth. There are paradiplomatic reasons for retaining it, but if a gloss, undoubtedly a correct one.—R.]

[8] Ver. 15.—["Separated" has a local sense not intended here.—R.]

[9] Ver. 17.—Of the two readings ἀνῆλθον (Rec.) and ἀπῆλθον, about equally attested, the second is decidedly preferable on internal grounds. Not only does the latter give a more formal and sharper antithesis; οὐδὲ ἀπῆλθον—ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθον, but the former betrays itself as a correction from the fact that ἀνέρχομαι or ἀναβαίνω is generally used of the journey to Jerusalem, as in ver. 18. Wieseler. ℵ. has ἀνῆλθον, [adopted by Tischendorf, Wordsworth. B. D. F. have ἀπῆλθον; adopted by Lachmann, Meyer, Wieseler, Alford, Ellicott; Lightfoot is doubtful. "Went away" follows the latter reading.—R.]

[10] Ver. 18.—Instead of Πέτρον (Rec.), Κηφᾶν is to be read, as also in ii. 9, 11, 14. So also ℵ. The Hebrew name was suppressed by the Greek gloss, hence in ii. 7. 8, where Paul himself wrote the Greek name, the variation Κηφᾶς is not found [So all modern editors. Ἱστορῆσαι means more than to see, "to visit, to make the acquaintance of."—R.]

[11] Ver. 23.—[The English text has been amended to bring out the force of the Greek imperfects.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 11. **Now I declare unto you—not after man.**—[Literally: "I make known unto you as respects the gospel, the one preached by me, that it is not according to man."—R.] To the warm burst of feeling succeeds the composed statement of reasons. Accordingly we have the formal *γνωρίζω*, and the address "brethren," which also shows that Paul, although in the introduction he gives no peculiar title of honor to the Galatian Christians, feels himself to be still standing in the fraternal relation to them. He takes this as his starting point with them, because his aim in what follows is to bring them back and win them again from their error. He first justifies his preceding rebuke by the distinct and formal assurance that his teaching is not of man. Of course this was not something entirely new to the church, yet it had, doubtless, been at first a merely tacit presupposition in connection with the Apostle's preaching, without having been expressly emphasized: hence the *γνωρίζω*; after it had been called in question, it must be definitely affirmed.

The gospel which was preached by me is most naturally referred to the preaching of the gospel among the Galatians, although self-evidently the same declaration was of general validity.—Οὐ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον literally: "not according to man," not after the fashion of man, not man's work. This applies not immediately to its origin, but to its character, which however is especially and primarily conditioned by its origin (ver. 12). The sequel shows the phrase to be nearly equivalent in sense to "scholastic" [*schulmässig*].

Ver. 12. **For neither did I receive it of man, neither was I taught it.**—"Neither did I" = any more than the Twelve. By the denial of any human origin of his gospel he asserts his equal rank with the other Apostles. The sentence receives a simple exposition when compared with ver. 1, which it more closely explains. The first and negative part: "neither did I receive it from man, neither was I taught it," is an explanation of "not of men, neither through man," while the second part, "but through revelation from Jesus Christ," is an explanation of "through Jesus Christ and God the Father," which is afterwards made yet more definite (vers. 15, 16).—[Lightfoot: The idea of the preposition (παρά) is sufficiently wide to include both the ἀπό and διά of ver. 1.—R.]

Through revelation from Jesus Christ.—This is commonly explained as merely a giving of instruction respecting the contents of the gospel, and there is then a difficulty as to when Christ gave to Paul this ἀποκάλυψις, discovery. Here Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is taken as *gen. subj.* = the revelation which Jesus Christ gave. Meyer explains it of revelations received soon after the event near Damascus, of which, however, there is no mention in the Acts. Others, with reason, refuse to assume any such revelations, but explain the "revelation" as identical with the actual appearance of Christ on the way to Damascus, through which Paul received certainty of that which is precisely the essence of the gospel, namely, "Jesus the Son of God." They are led to this, moreover, by a just instinct, that it is not the developed contents of that which Paul taught, that is here in question. This explanation, therefore, is quite correct, and Paul's reference here is solely to the fact of that appearance on the way. Yet he has in view chiefly, not a receiving of instruction thereby, but his *call to the apostleship itself*, for this was a call "to preach the gospel" (see also ver. 18), and therefore a "receiving the gospel." The expression, that he had received the gospel through revelation from Jesus Christ, has primarily the simple meaning, that through this he had been called and appointed to preach. In the phrase "through revelation," *etc.*, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is at all events the *subjective genitive*, for Christ is in any case to be regarded as active in the installation of the Apostle (ver. 1), and hence in his call to preach. As the object of this "revelation" we are to understand not the contents of the gospel, but more simply Christ Himself, hence it is = by Christ's revealing Himself to me.—This view is, it is true, in apparent contradiction to the "taught" immediately preceding, which seems to point to a definitely developed doctrine, but

only in apparent contradiction. It is only in the negative that he speaks of "being taught;" in order to deny most entirely the human calling to preach, Paul denies also the "being taught;" he did not, he says, first receive in a course of school instruction, his equipment, authorization and capacity to preach, hence not in a secondary, derived manner, as a scholar (of the Apostles). Over against this human origin, Paul now simply asserts his "revelation from Jesus Christ" which need not be complemented by "taught"—an expression in itself awkward too—but merely by "received."—In what immediately follows it is not "through revelation from Jesus Christ," so much as the negative "neither was I taught it," that is proven. For in vers. 15, 16, where "through revelation" has to be touched, it is mentioned properly only as a historical notice, in order to mark the transition from the first period of his life to the second, hence only in the subordinate clause. From this, however, the conclusion cannot of course be drawn; "I was taught through revelation from Jesus Christ;" for this reason first, that then we should expect a detailed statement of this positive side. But all that was to be said on the positive side, had been said already in the short *δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* because here a simple fact only was in question; on the other hand the "received from man" and "taught" could have taken place in many ways and at different times, might have been of long continuance; and on this account the demonstration was needed that there had been no point of time whatever, when such instruction from the senior Apostles (whom he has in mind throughout in "from man"), could have taken place, since at first he has been hostile to Christianity, and after his calling had never lived in intercourse with the senior Apostles, though at the same time he had already preached the gospel. And, he proceeds to say in chap. ii., when afterwards, he was once somewhat longer with them, he then appeared as a fully equal Apostle, and was so acknowledged; hence there could no longer be any talk of his occupying the place of a pupil.

[Since the design of the Apostle in what follows is to prove that his doctrine as well as his apostleship was God-given, that He was "taught of God," it seems more natural to refer "revelation from Jesus Christ," to instruction as well as to calling to the apostleship. WORDSWORTH calls attention to the force of *ἀλλά*, which he considers to be here "except" "save"—"nor was I taught it *except* by revelation." He was *θεοδίδακτος*. And this view is further sustained by the omission of the article before the noun, which is not rendered definite either by the genitive following or by the fact that there was but one revelation (Paul undoubtedly had many). To what instructive revelation does he refer? Undoubtedly to that on the way to Damascus, but not to that exclusively. Nor to any partic-[illegible] revelation soon after his conversion (AQUINAS, MEYER, ELLICOTT, ALFORD, who suggest the sojourn in Arabia, ver. 17, as the probable time), but to the revelation on the way to Damascus as "the fundamental and central illumination," "followed by special revelation" at different periods of his life. Comp. Acts xxii. 17; xxiii. 11; 1 Cor. xi. 13; 2 Cor. xii. 1 sq.; Gal. ii. 2. SCHAFF. Schmoller's view on this point colors his notes on the entire section.—R.]

Ver. 13. **For ye heard of my conversation in time past**, *etc.*—How far this statement is meant to confirm the previous proposition (*γάρ*), has just been indicated. Perhaps, however, he also emphasizes his former Jewish zeal, with particular reference to his Judaistic opposers. He wishes thereby to call attention to the fact that his present anti-Judaistic position does not result from any want of acquaintance with Judaism, but that, on the contrary, it rests upon only too intimate an acquaintance with it.

Ἰουδαϊσμός: the word in itself, it is true, signifies nothing more than the Jewish religion; yet Paul, in this connection, evidently throws more meaning into it, joining with it the additional idea: Jewish zealotism. Only thus is a proper meaning given to "surpassed in Judaism" (ver. 14). This again finds its explanation in **how that beyond measure I persecuted**, *etc.* "He was really engaged in the work of destruction, not merely in that of disturbance." MEYER.

Ver. 14. **In mine own nation.** — Literally "race," the people are regarded as a single race, descending from the same ancestor. — **My ancestral traditions**:—not the Pharisaic traditions or the Mosaic law, together with those traditions, but teachings which the fathers of the collective people held (see WIESELER). The phrase: "the traditions of my fathers," in itself, describes only the doctrinal and ritual definitions respecting the Jewish worship which then obtained, though, of course, resting on the Mosaic law as their foundation. But Paul, in calling himself a zealot, who surpassed many of his contemporaries, has undoubtedly in view chiefly his observance of these usages according to the peculiarly strict rule of Pharisaism. [SCHAFF: "The word *παράδοσις*, 'tradition,' which figures so prominently in the Roman Catholic controversy, in the general sense, embraces everything which is taught and handed down, either orally or in writing, or in both ways, from generation to generation; in the particular sense it may be used favorably of the divine doctrine, and even of Christianity itself, as is the case 1 Cor. xi. 2 (E. V. 'ordinances' instead of 'traditions'); 2 Thess. ii. 15; iii. 6, or unfavorably of the human additions to, and perversions of the religion of the Old or New Testament, in which case it is generally more clearly defined as the traditions 'of the elders' or 'of men,' as Matt. xxv. 2; Mark vii. 3, 5, 8; Col. ii. 8. In our passage it means the whole Jewish religion, or mode of worship, divine and human; but in the Pharisaic sense, as opposed to Christianity." LIGHTFOOT's paraphrase is excellent: "My early education is a proof that I did not receive the gospel from man. I was brought up in a rigid school of ritualism, directly opposed to the liberty of the gospel. I was from age and temper a staunch adherent of the principles of that school. Acting upon them, I relentlessly persecuted the Christian brotherhood. No human agency, therefore, could have brought about the change. It required a direct interposition from God."—R.]

Vers. 15, 16. **But when it pleased God.** —In the interest of his demonstration of the in-

dependence of his apostolate, as respects men, he here studiously emphasizes the activity of God in conferring it, going back even to the divine ordination thereto at his very conception. [LIGHTFOOT: "Observe how words are accumulated to tell upon the one point on which he is insisting—the sole agency of God as distinct from his own efforts."—R.]—**From my mother's womb**=when he was yet in his mother's womb, he was already set apart as an Apostle. [SCHAFF: "Comp. Jerem. i. 5; Isa. xlix. 1. The decree of redemption is eternal as God's love and omniscience, but its temporal realization begins in each individual case with the natural birth, and more properly with the gospel call and the spiritual birth. He refers, however, here more particularly to his call to the *apostleship*, for which he was 'set apart' or destined, elected and dedicated by a Divine act. Comp. the same term, Rom. i. 1; Acts xiii. 2."—R.]—His calling followed afterwards near Damascus. In the Acts, Christ's appearance only is mentioned; here Paul takes up the event with a more doctrinal reference, and hence refers this appearance to its first cause, God. This, of course, implies no discrepancy with the narrative of the Acts.—Although appearances favor such a view, "called" does not denote an earlier act, preceding the revelation (ver. 16) which, therefore, refers to subsequent revelations (MEYER). [The aorist participle, *καλέσας*, in this connection, at first sight, seems to refer to an act prior to the "revelation," not, however, necessarily long before. It does not mean a "calling" in the Divine mind, as some infer from its connection with "set apart;" but most probably the Divine act which, "by means of His grace," resulted immediately in his conversion, when the revelation was made. ELLICOTT: "The *moving* cause of the call was the Divine pleasure; the *mediating* cause, the boundless grace of God; the instrument, the heaven-sent voice" or revelation; the purpose of the setting apart, the call and the revelation alike was, "that I might preach him among the Gentiles." "To reveal" depends on "pleased," not on "called."—R.]

So then "reveal" is only the explanation of the "calling;" more precisely: there is thereby indicated what took place at the calling, namely, the enlightenment and conviction then effected. For this reason also, because the calling comes into mention only as respects its result, he speaks only of revealing "His Son within me." Accordingly Paul, in this passage, indeed, says nothing of having had an outward appearance of Christ. But, that Paul, in the expression, **to reveal his Son within me**, was thinking of a definite, individual fact, which was connected with a definite locality, the city or the neighborhood of the city of Damascus, and not of a purely internal event, appears most clearly from what follows ver. 17, "returned again." "Had the event of his conversion been a purely inward one, his recollection of the locality where it occurred would not, more than twenty years after, have still forced itself so strongly into the foreground that, in describing only the general inner result of that revolution, he would have been constrained at once to think of Damascus." PARET, *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1858. II. 1. Furthermore and principally, the whole proof which Paul here brings for his apostolic parity rests upon the fact that he had really and truly had an appearance of the Risen One. "I have not been called by men, but just as truly as the older Apostles, by Christ Himself to be an Apostle," is his fundamental thought: how could he be thinking on a mere internal event, a vocation by Christ only in spirit? With that, instead of his equality, his difference from the others would have been established. Therefore, if any conclusion is justified, it is this: Paul has here in his eye the event related in the Acts; presupposing, however, the outward occurrence as well known, he avails himself only of that element of it which has pertinence here, namely, that he was inwardly enlightened concerning Christ, that Christ was revealed to his inner eye, to faith. Of his conversion in itself, Paul does not speak here, or only so far as it was a condition of his capacity for the apostleship, as through it the "calling" to be an Apostle became a reality. He dates his calling, therefore, from the moment of his conversion. Therefore, he continues: **that I might preach him among the Gentiles.**—Him whom God has revealed to him as His Son, he was, and is still (therefore the present), to declare as such; this is the gospel which he received "through revelation from Jesus Christ" (ver. 12), this "the gospel which was preached by me" (ver. 11).—Ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν: *among* the Gentile nations, therefore ἐν, not the dative. For Paul preached not merely to the Gentiles, but among the Gentile nations, first to the Jews dwelling among them, and only then to the heathen themselves.

Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood.—Εὐθέως, of course, belongs strictly not to the negative sentence immediately following, but to the affirmative sentence: "went away into Arabia," it does not, however, exclude a brief previous activity in Damascus, since the Apostle was only concerned to prove that he did not go out from Damascus in any other direction than Arabia, and particularly that he did not go to Jerusalem.—"I conferred not," I addressed no communication to flesh and blood, in order to receive instruction and direction—"flesh and blood;" here merely—one clothed with a mortal body, therefore in sense equivalent simply to —Man. The conception is thus strongly expressed, because Man appears here in antithesis with God.

Ver. 17. **Neither went I away to Jerusalem to them who were apostles before me.**—This is the only distinction which he concedes between himself and them.—**Into Arabia.** "This Arabian journey is to be regarded as his first essay of foreign labor, and it is, by εὐθέως, put in connection with the purpose of the divine revelation, that he should preach the gospel among the heathen."—(MEYER). Yet I would not on this account wholly reject the other conjectures that have been offered as to the purpose of this journey, such as seeking protection from the Jews, "severing himself from pressure of the national spirit," and partially also, perhaps to prepare himself in stillness for his work.—This journey into Arabia is not mentioned in the Acts, probably because it was of short duration

and therefore perhaps not known to Luke; it is, with most probability, placed in the time of the "many days," Acts ix. 23; the flight from Damascus must therefore be placed at the end of this second visit there. [Two questions arise: 1. as to the *place;* 2. the *object* of this sojourn. 1. Although "the desert region about Damascus" may have been the place (since Justin includes Damascus in Arabia, and Xenophon applies the name to the region beyond the Euphrates, *Anab.* I. 5), yet Paul is always more definite in his geographical statements than most ancient authors, and as in the only other place where Arabia is mentioned in the N. T. (Gal. iv. 25), it must mean the Sinaitic peninsula, it seems decidedly preferable to refer it to that locality in this case. Besides, as LIGHTFOOT well remarks, any other view "deprives this visit of a significance which, on a more probable hypothesis, it possesses in relation to this crisis of St. Paul's life." If iv. 25 refers to "Hagar" as the Arabic name of Sinai, the argument is conclusive, for he was not likely to have heard this name anywhere but on the spot. If it be a mere geographical remark, then it is a very indefinite one, granting that Paul here uses "Arabia" with so extended a signification. 2. "Paul's object in this residence in Arabia, as seems most probable from the context, was not to preach the gospel—but to enjoy a season of undisturbed preparation for his high and holy calling. This period, therefore, belongs more properly to the history of the Apostle's inward life; and this affords the simplest explanation of the silence of the book of Acts respecting it. It was for him a sort of substitute for the three years' personal intercourse with the Lord, enjoyed by the other Apostles" (SCHAFF, *Apostolic Church*, p. 236). This view of the *object* confirms the opinion that the Sinaitic peninsula was the locality. Where Moses and Elijah had been before him, Paul went. "Thus in the wilderness of Sinai, as on the mount of transfiguration, the three dispensations met in one;" Law, Prophecy and Gospel; Moses, Elijah and Paul. Comp. LIGHTFOOT, p. 87 sq.; STANLEY, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 50.—R.]

Ver. 18. **Then after three years.**—To be reckoned probably from his calling to the apostleship; for he means: I did not go up at once to Jerusalem, but only three years after. This is the first journey of Paul to Jerusalem, Acts ix. 26.—Ἱστορῆσαι K.=in order to become personally acquainted with Cephas, not: in order to obtain instruction from him. The more precise expression is therefore designedly chosen.—**Fifteen days.**—Had it been in itself possible that Paul at this time received instruction, still a course of instruction strictly so called, a schooling under the senior Apostles would not have been possible in so short a time. Hence the length of his stay is expressly mentioned. [Nor does the singling out of Peter prove anything more than his prominence among the Twelve; Paul puts himself on a par with all the Apostles, including Peter.—R.]

Ver. 19. **But other of the apostles I did not see.**—"Apostle" must be taken in the strict sense of the Twelve, since it is precisely his parity with these that Paul wishes to make out. Therefore **James the Lord's brother** is either to be reckoned among the Apostles and identified with James, the son of Alpheus, and so "brother" to be taken in the sense of "cousin;" or "save" (εἰ μή) is to be referred only to "I did not see" =another one of the apostles I did not see, but I saw only James. Grammatically the former is decidedly the less difficult; but the identification with James, the son of Alpheus, is attended with great difficulties. Comp. WIESELER *in loco.* Besides this impression is evidently conveyed, that Paul by the special addition he appends to the name, wishes to distinguish this James from the Apostles, not to include him in their number. For this reason the second interpretation is to be preferred. Although not an Apostle, this James could still be mentioned by Paul, as is done here, along with the Twelve, because he had a standing well-nigh apostolic. Respecting the question how the James mentioned chap. ii. 9, is related to this James, see remarks on that passage. "The notice that at that time Paul only saw Peter and James in Jerusalem, does not conflict with the indefinite τοὺς ἀποστόλους, Acts ix. 27, but authentically defines it." MEYER.

[The interpretation turns upon the much discussed question what is meant by "the brethren of the Lord," for unless this James can be identified with James, the son of Alpheus, he is not an Apostle. The view of LIGHTFOOT, ALFORD and others that he might be an Apostle, and yet not of the Twelve, seems altogether untenable. Only one point is undisputed: This James is the one who was frequently called by the church fathers "bishop of Jerusalem," and also "the Just." Whether he were an Apostle, whether he wrote the general Epistle, whether referred to again in this Epistle, are open questions. Without entering into an extended discussion, it will suffice to mention the leading views and their bearing on this passage, referring the reader to special dissertations. There are three principal theories. That the brethren of the Lord were 1. the sons of Joseph and Mary; 2. the sons of Joseph by a former wife; 3. the cousins of our Lord, either the sons of the Virgin's sister, or the sons of Joseph's brother, *etc.* 1 and 2 are the older views; 3 originated with Jerome.—On this latter theory alone can we identify James, the brother of our Lord, with James, the son of Alpheus, for the other theories imply that Joseph, not Alpheus, was his father. But this theory is with difficulty supported, for not only did it originate in an attempt to justify and thus enjoin virginity in man as well as woman, but it has always been forced to call to its aid mere conjectures. Hence, if it be rejected, our verse means that Paul saw none other of the Apostles, but he did see the Lord's brother. To which view we are in a measure forced also by the statement of John (vii. 5: "neither did his brethren believe in him") after the twelve were chosen. Comp. John vi. 67, where "the twelve" are spoken of. That his brethren were afterwards believers is stated (Acts i. 14, where they are mentioned in distinction from the Apostles); the reason of the so speedy conversion *may* be found in 1 Cor. xv. 7, if "James," of whom "he was seen," be distinguished from "the twelve" (ver. 5) and "all the Apostles" in the same verse.

As between 1 and 2, it may be remarked, that it seems more natural to consider the brethren of our Lord the sons of Mary, were it not for two reasons, first, the instinctive repugnance (Jos. ADD. ALEXANDER) to such a view, and secondly, the fact that the dying Saviour committed His mother to another than these brethren, a strange fact, were they her own sons. Still these are not insuperable objections. The whole question is an open one, and it was only necessary to discuss it here so far as to decide upon the meaning of this particular passage. The reader is referred to LANGE's *Commentary, Matthew*, p. 255 sq., where LANGE defends the modified cousin-theory, and SCHAFF advocates at length the first view stated above. Also to LANGE's *Commentary, James*, p. 9 sq.; SCHAFF, *Monograph on James*, Berlin, 1842; ALFORD, *Prolegomena, Epistle of James.* Comp. the authorities quoted by these writers. The best classification and history of opinions will be found in LIGHTFOOT, *Dissertat.* II., p. 247 sq., which has been freely used in the above remarks. He, however, defends the second theory. As regards this passage, it seems on the whole best to consider this James—1. as *not* identical with the son of Alpheus; 2. as *not* an Apostle. Both points are involved in the exegesis of the passage, but as *εἰ μή* is susceptible of either interpretation, these results must be reached on other than grammatical grounds. The grounds for the above opinions cannot be stated at length, but may be found in the more extended discussions. —R.]

[WORDSWORTH: "Paul's meeting with Peter and James. Peter cordially received him.—'Fifteen days;' ample time for Peter to have seen what I was, and to have proclaimed me to the world as a deceiver, if the Gospel which I preached was not consistent with his own. Therefore they who cavil at me involve Peter also in the charge of conniving at error and delusion." But thus indicating his respect for Peter and James, "he wisely guards himself against any imputations on the part of his Judaizing adversaries, that he, a new Apostle, was liable to the charge of disparaging the original Apostles of Christ. And he prepares the way for what he is about to say in the next chapter concerning his resistance to St. Peter."—R.]

Ver. 20. **Now the things which I write unto you.**—Ver. 20 contains a solemn asseveration, which has its ground in the importance of the account just given for the Apostle's purpose, namely, to prove his own apostolic dignity.

[Ver. 21. **Into the regions of Syria and Cilicia**;—No mention is made of his going into Syria in the narrative in the Acts, but he is said to have been brought down to Cesarea, and sent forth to Tarsus (in Cilicia), where Barnabas afterwards went to seek him (Acts ix. 30; xi. 25). There is no discrepancy. Paul may have gone to Antioch on his way to Cilicia, or returned that way in his labors before Barnabas came for him; or the expression here may be indefinite, since "Syria and Cilicia" appears in history almost as a generic geographical term, the more important district being mentioned first. Comp. CONY. and HOWSON. 1. pp. 104, 105. LANGE's *Comm., Acts*, p. 182.—R.]

Ver. 22. **And I was unknown.**—This remark also belongs to the proof that he had not been a disciple of the Apostles, for had he stood in near connection with them, he could not but have become known to the churches of Judea.—**The churches of Judea**, *i. e.*, outside of Jerusalem. [The phrase **which are in Christ Jesus**, doubtless means "which are incorporated with Him who is the head" (ELLICOTT), yet it is also used to distinguish the bodies of believers from other bodies, of Jews, for example. ALFORD: "By thus showing the spirit with which the churches of Judea were actuated toward him, he marks more strongly the contrast between them and the Galatian Judaizers."—R.]

Ver. 23. **Is now preaching the faith.**—*Πίστις* here also not=Christian doctrine [it being very doubtful, as ELLICOTT remarks, whether *πίστις* ever has in the N. T., this more distinctly objective sense, so frequent in ecclesiastical writers. See also the valuable note of LIGHTFOOT, p. 152, sq. on the word "faith."—R.], but=Faith; he preached that men should believe, as well as, of course, what they should believe. Formerly he sought by persecution to hinder men from believing in Christ, that is, he was destroying it; *i. e.*, Faith.

Ver. 24. **In me.**—Paul is not only regarded as the occasion of the praise, but as the foundation on which their faith rested. "With this impression which Paul then made upon the congregations in Judea, the hateful plotting of the Judaizers in Galatia against him stood in striking contrast. Therefore the added clause." MEYER. [ELLICOTT: "The preposition in such cases as the present, points to the object as being, as it were, the *sphere* in which, or the *substratum* on which the action takes place."—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *How Paul was taught.* A right understanding of ver. 12, according to which Paul here denies only that his calling and preparation to be an Apostle (a preacher of the gospel) was through men, is by no means inconsistent with assuming, as in any case is necessary, that Paul learned the historical particulars of the life of Jesus not by immediate intuition, but through the testimony of men, as indeed the Apostle in other passages unhesitatingly expresses the traditional character of his historical knowledge, as in 1 Cor. xv. 1; ix. 14; vii. 10, 25; also xi. 23. Comp. on this the instructive article of PARET, "*Paul and Jesus.*" *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* B. 3, H. 1, 1858. "The passage in the Galatians," remarks PARET, "becomes, in fact, first fairly intelligible by assuming as above. Just because Paul was remitted, in respect to particulars, to the testimony of others, could his opposers make the attempt to represent his whole knowledge and teaching, and ultimately his faith in Jesus itself, as something merely derivative, to construct the whole man, as it were, out of purely external Christian influences, human in immediate origin, and thereby to depress him in the esteem of his churches below the Apostolic elevation, to place him on one level with common Christians, and to dispute his right to make valid decisions in the domain of doctrine and discipline. If his antagonists thus made this one side promi-

nent, in a one-sided, unintelligent way, Paul was constrained, accordingly, to bring the other side forward in the strongest light: to show that it was not from men or through any man that he from a persecutor had become an Apostle, but through Jesus Christ Himself, whom he had seen alive; that his gospel was not a school task got by heart, but rested upon a revelation of Jesus." But according to the representation of the course of events in our chapter, according to which Paul for three years did not come at all, and then came only for a very short time, into contact with the senior Apostles, we must assume that he did not derive even his knowledge of the historical particulars of the life of Jesus from these, but from other Christians; possibly from Ananias. In view of the attack which his apostolic rank suffered, compared with that of the senior Apostles, even this circumstance is of moment to him, although it was not from the beginning precisely the result of design.

[It will appear from the exegetical notes on ver. 12, how labored an effort is required to support the view, that Paul does not intend to assert here that he had learned his gospel through revelation from Jesus Christ. Of course on any theory of inspiration, save that mechanical one, which ignores the human element, it will be admitted that Paul learned the facts of the life and death of Christ from human lips; but that must be a narrow view of the gospel as Paul preached it, which could limit his "being taught it" to such human statements. "Paul does not mean here the outward historical information concerning the life of Christ, but the internal exhibition of Christ to his spiritual sense as the Messiah, and the only and all-sufficient Saviour of the world, and the unfolding of the true import of His death and resurrection; in other words the spiritual communication of the gospel system of saving truth as taught by him in his sermons and Epistles" (Schaff). It is more in accordance both with Paul's argument here, and with the actual phenomena of his history to believe that after the revelation on the way to Damascus there were "subsequent special disclosures of the Spirit, respecting single points of Christian doctrine and practice; for we are to conceive the inspiration of the Apostles in general as not merely an act, done once for all, but a permanent influence and state, varying in strength as occasion required" (Schaff). Ellicott very judiciously remarks: "On the one hand we may reverently presume that all the fundamental truths of the Gospel would be *fully* revealed to St. Paul before he commenced preaching; so, on the other, it might have been ordained, that (in accordance with the laws of our spiritual nature) its deeper mysteries and profounder harmonies should be seen and felt through the practical experiences of his apostolical labors."—R.]

2. *The Revelation from Jesus Christ.* Paul has been called by the Lord Himself to the apostleship, as well as the other Apostles, with the single exception that they were called by the Lord in His state of humiliation, he by the Lord in His state of exaltation; this is the fundamental truth, which stands to the Apostle immovably firm, and on which he founded the whole proof of his apostolic parity. There can therefore be no doubt that he was conscious of an objective appearance of Christ, in the well known occurrence on the way to Damascus, and we have in the decision with which Paul himself in this doctrinal treatise, in opposition to hostilely disposed antagonists, asserts this immediateness of his calling through Christ, the simplest and surest proof for the historical character of the narrative respecting the conversion of Paul contained in the Acts. For, as has been already remarked in the exegesis, we are of course not to think of a merely internal vocation—a calling in spirit. Such a notion would take away from the proof which Paul is setting forth its very ground and foundation. It is true that in it a spiritual operation, an operation of the Spirit of God upon the mind of the Apostle, also took place ("to reveal within me"), but only in consequence of the objective outward appearance of Christ. This itself was, first of all, the deciding and penetrating power: upon it all turned. And very naturally. That Christ had risen and was living, became by means of this at once a certainty to Paul. This, however, involved almost necessarily that total revolution of all his views and of the direction of his life, which followed. For Paul was a man who even previously stood upon the foundation of Israelitish faith, and whose faith in the Messiah was in itself steadfast, and who had even been misled by this to take his hostile position against Jesus and His cause, under the delusion that the dignity of Messiah was claimed for Him presumptuously. So much the more overpowering must the impression of the actual appearance of Christ, who was thereby manifested as risen and exalted to Heaven, have been upon him. This was a sudden collapse of the system held fast with so much zeal, a sudden conviction of the nothingness of that persuasion to which he had so energetically clung, and, moreover, a conviction through fact, against which therefore there was nothing more to object. As it would have been almost incomprehensible if that effect had not followed, which did follow, so on the other hand this effect presupposes the definite cause which is related in the Acts, and indicated by the Apostle himself in this passage. [That the conversion of Paul must necessarily follow the actual appearance of Jesus Christ to him, is not to be assumed in order to establish the fact of such appearance; for as in the narrative prominence is given to the actual revelation *to* Paul, here the stress is laid by the Apostle himself on the other fact, the revelation of Christ *within* him; both facts are essential in accounting for the conversion of Paul, and for Christianity itself.—R.] That the Apostle in this passage by "revelation from Christ," "to reveal His Son within me," means primarily only the external revelation at his conversion is, of course, not inconsistent with his having received subsequent revelations, such as that mentioned in Acts xxii. 17, which, however, as an εἶναι ἐν ἐκστάσει, appears to be distinguished from that first fundamental one, or such as are alluded to in 2 Cor. xii., and besides immediately afterwards in this Epistle ii. 2. (Comp. 1 Tim. i. 13).

3. *The calling of Paul.* The conversion of Paul according to his own representation is to be viewed essentially as a call to the apostleship. Although at the same time his conversion was of course for

him personally, of the greatest moment, and undoubtedly the condition of his apostolic activity (comp. 1 Tim. i. 14), yet strictly speaking the appearance on the way to Damascus had as its end the calling to the apostleship as well, and not merely his personal conversion to Christianity. Indeed, according to the Apostle's own conception, the eighth chapter of Acts would be better entitled: The Calling of Paul. In this relation of the event to the whole church—inasmuch as it specially concerned the calling of an Apostle, that which is extraordinary in it, namely, the revelation of Christ finds its explanation. This event appears also as a call to the apostleship according to the representation of the Apostle in Acts ix. 15; xxii. 15; xxvi. 17, that is, it was first made known to Ananias, but in immediate connection with the wonderful scene, so that the purpose of the latter cannot be mistaken, and Paul, before Herod Agrippa, Acts xxvi. 17, could speak of the message which was communicated to him by the mouth of Ananias, as an immediate message of Jesus to himself. The definite direction to preach the gospel among the Gentiles, Paul first received, according to Acts xxii. 21, during his first visit to Jerusalem. Yet even the first commission he received, pointed in a very distinct manner to the Gentiles, so that from the very beginning his call as Apostle of the Gentiles, in distinction from the other Apostles, was firmly established. So far, therefore, Paul is not to be reckoned with them, as thirteenth or indeed as twelfth (if the choice of Matthias be considered a premature one), but he stands beside them, in a certain measure over against them, with a special calling; only in the originality of his apostleship he is not inferior to them, but fully their peer. Comp ii. 7, 9. Futhermore, the special purpose of his calling stands certainly in a causal connection with the manner of the calling. "The Paul who through so unexpected a mercy of God was brought to the knowledge of His Son, was well fitted for the preaching of the same among the Gentiles, called as they also were out of God's unlooked for mercy" (Rieger). The very manner of his calling, out of pure grace, passing thus a sentence of condemnation upon the legal position, caused him to know that to the Gentiles also, who are ἄνομοι, the way to salvation of grace must stand open. Comp. also for 2 and 3, Lange's *Commentary*, *Acts*, p. 165 sq.

4. *Paul set apart by God.* Paul cannot regard himself otherwise than as destined by God Himself, even in his mother's womb, for what he now is, separated to the peculiar calling of the apostleship (an analogy, as it were, to the Nazarite's vow, by which the child was dedicated, even from the womb, to be a Nazarite). His life up to his conversion, Paul then of course regards as standing in opposition to this, his divine destination; and therefore a special vocation was necessary. This vocation, however, has its root in the elections and as this, of course, was an entirely free one, founded on no manner of merit (as being entirely precedent to the whole course of his life), the calling, therefore, was a pure act of grace ("by his grace"), on account of the opposition in which the previous life of Paul stood to his destined work. In the connection of this particular passage Paul contemplates his previous life from no other point of view, and certainly therefore does not designate himself as one set apart even from his mother's womb, because he thought that before his conversion he possessed qualities for the sake of which God had called him. It is true his natural gifts and his acquirements of knowledge served to capacitate him for his vocation; and it was doubtless providential that even before his conversion he was the person that he was; and this natural adaptedness itself had its root in the divine destination of the man. And negatively, beyond question, the legal zeal by which Paul was animated, bringing as it did his subsequent evangelical position into so much more decided contrast with it, was advantageous to his apostolic activity, as in general the zeal with which Paul acted—at first, it is true, in the interest of the law, turned afterwards to the good of the gospel. Otherwise, however, his religious character, as a blindly legal, Pharisaical one, resting on the righteousness of works, stood in decided opposition to his destination. "'He has called me,' says the Apostle. But how? For my standing as a Pharisee? For my holy and blameless life? For my admirable works? No; I trow! Still less, then, for my blasphemy against God, my persecution and mad rage. How then? Through his pure grace." Luther.—[Calvin:—He intends to assert that his calling depends on the secret election of God; and that he was ordained an Apostle not because by his own industry he had fitted himself, but because God had counted him worthy to undertake that high office, and because, before he was born, he had been set apart by the secret purpose of God. The Apostle had most explicitly attributed his calling to the free grace of God, when he traced its origin to his separation from the womb. But he repeats the direct statement ("by his grace") both to take away all grounds of boasting by his commendation of Divine grace, and to testify his own gratitude to God.—R.]

5. *Paul's walk in Judaism.* "His former walk Paul calls a walk in Judaism: if it had been a walk in the footsteps of the faith of Abraham, it would have led him to faith in the gospel. It was, therefore, a walk in the Judaism that was tending towards apostasy, that, under pretext of the law, would defend itself against the faith in Christ." Rieger.—Judaism of course here means the Jewish religion in its then form, when the soul of the Old Covenant, by which it pointed beyond itself, and in general its character of promise, was more or less overlooked. Or at least the legal sense in which the whole divine revelation was then apprehended, took away the right understanding of this character of promise. Hence the incapacity to understand Him in whom the fulfillment came. On this account proficiency in Judaism and persecution of the Christian church could go hand in hand with each other.

6. *Paul's solemn oaths.* The solemn asseverations which Paul more than once utters (in ver. 20, Rom. i. 9; ix. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 31), would of themselves sufficiently show how little the passages, Matt. v. 34 sq., James v. 12 sq., are meant to forbid swearing in itself and totally, and how unwarranted it is to limit lawful oaths to oaths required by the magistrate, while on the other

hand we certainly cannot be too strongly warned against all lightness in the taking of an oath. It must ever, as here, have respect to a weighty matter. [Wordsworth from Augustine: "An oath which cometh not from the evil of him who swears, but from the unbelief of him *to* whom he swears, is not against our Lord's precept: 'Swear not.' Our Lord commands that *as far as in us lies* we should not swear; which command is broken by those who have in their mouths an oath as if it were something pleasant in itself. As far as in him lies, the Apostle swears not. He does not catch at an oath with eagerness, but when he swears it is by constraint, through the infirmity or incredulity of those who will not otherwise believe what he says."—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 11. Rieger:—In the address he has omitted the customary appellations: saints, beloved of God, etc.; after the first rebuke, however, he now adds, as the mollifying ointment, the name of "brethren." What we cannot always do in unimpaired love, may yet be done at times in hope.

Ver. 12. Luther (who emphasizes this so expressly in remarking on this passage):—Human teaching, human tradition, though it come down from holy fathers and teachers, from the holy Church herself, is in itself nothing; for in all this there may be error, just because it is human. And hence we must not let any one scare us by appealing to never so great human authorities; over against all this the only concern is, to abide simply by the Word of God.

Spener:—Such as should be true, enlightened preachers, must have learned the Gospel through revelation from Christ; not immediately, to be sure, but so that, having been instructed by men, Christ's spirit by means of such instruction having become a power in their hearts, they truly have a divine light in their souls, from which they then enlighten others.

The gospel no work of man: 1. as a word of doctrine, not sprung from men, nor taught by men, but by Christ Himself (who brought it Himself and through whom alone His people have it): 2. as a word of comfort, only through Him can we commit ourselves to it; 3. as a word of power, in which there should be no change, from which no departure.

Ver. 13. Rieger:—Oh, how often and how toilsomely do we gather much that in the right light must be counted harm and dung, and cast from us.—Quesnel:—A man may make his past sins known out of pride, but also out of humility. Whoever does not boast himself of the same, but humbles himself therefor before God, and willingly bears the shame of them before men, not relying upon himself, makes a good confession, but one not needful to be uttered before every man, as sometimes it would bring more scandal than benefit.—From Starke:—God is wise, permitting some things to be accomplished even by His enemies, that in His time He will direct to His own honor, to which before they were quite opposed. Paul studied in the law, and in his ancestral institutions, that he might thereby the better withstand the Christians. This afterwards served to enable him to dispute all the better with the Jews in favor of Christianity, as thoroughly understanding their side.

Ver. 14. Berlenb. Bible:—Even unconverted men may be exceedingly zealous for ancestral traditions, traditional doctrines.—[Yes, the might of traditions, because received from "my fathers,"—whether from God or no, not being taken into the account,—is often in proportion to the ignorance of real Christianity. How conservative, yet often how contracting and how cruel the zeal for "the traditions of my fathers!" True in every age.—R.]—Starke:—Good intentions do not of themselves make a thing good before God. Many a one means well in his conduct, and see, he still is doing a sin; yes, out of good intentions the most cruel actions may sometimes arise. Such sins, however, are much less heinous than those which spring from real godlessness and malice.

On vers. 13, 14.—Judaism and the Old Testament are different from one another: 1. the former closes the sense for Christ; 2. the latter opens it.—Persecution of the Church of God 1. takes place so easily in false zeal; 2. is so evil, therefore, take good heed!—When against others, so zealous; when for them, so lukewarm!—Take heed: is not thy progress, in reality, a retrogression?—Zeal for ancestral traditions 1. in itself good, but 2. no proof of a converted heart.—Condemnation of the perverseness of a former walk: 1. It *must* take place within, as a sign of a converted heart; 2. it *may* also become necessary before others, yet so that it is always done in humility.

Ver. 15. Würt. Summ.:—Behold the Fatherly Providence of God, who careth for us and marks out the course of our life from our mother's womb. Think not that God hath passed thee over, and that thou must care for thyself. Fear God and trust Him, for what He has designed for us from our mother's womb will be sure to come, and no one shall divert it from us.—Berlenb. Bible:—As Paul here does, so should we look back and behold God from behind, as God says to Moses. God gives preintimations, which are forgotten. But then men should wake up when the work of God is fulfilled, and bethink themselves. His work is nothing uncertain and doubtful, although we cannot constrain others to believe it. Nevertheless we yet ourselves may know well enough how we are to look upon it.

[Bushnell:—Every man's life a plan of God. Go to God Himself, and ask for the calling of God; for as certainly as He has a place or calling for you, He will somehow guide you into it. Do you call it success, that you are getting on in a plan of your own? There cannot be a greater delusion.—R.]

Ver. 16. Spener:—To the rightly profitable administration of the preacher's office, there is needful the revelation of God in us, that we should have a living knowledge of that which we are to declare to others. Without this, the word preached retains, to be sure, its power, if it is left pure and unadulterated; but such people cannot well leave it pure, or set it forth worthily; they understand not to apply it rightly, and destroy much of its power with the hearers.—

Berl. Bible:—The true work of God is done within, albeit He uses all manner of means thereto. The hurt is within; therefore, must the enlightenment also have place within. God must come and take away the veil. There needs then a heavenly illumination. This is the crown of conversions, that the Son becomes right plainly known to a man. But there are many veils between, and one after another is taken away, till one comes at last into the knowledge of God and the Son.

Rieger:—The Son of God is still the pith and kernel of all revelation to be wished for in the heart.—Luther:—If the gospel is a revelation of the Son of God, as Paul declares, it is then certain that it does not accuse poor consciences, nor terrify them, but of Christ alone does it teach, who is no law nor work, but our righteousness, wisdom, sanctification, and redemption. —The gospel is a divine word, that comes down from Heaven, and is revealed by the Holy Ghost, yet so that the outward word goes before. For even St. Paul himself first heard the outward word from Heaven: Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? Not till then did he have secret and hidden, inner revelations.—Among the Gentiles, therefore, should be preached no law, but the gospel; no Moses, but God's Son; no righteousness of works, but the righteousness of faith. This is the right preaching, whereto the heathen have claim, and which is apt for them. — Starke:—Paul was chiefly a teacher of the Gentiles, and that of divine purpose. Therefore we act not against God's counsel if we keep especially to Paul's writings (not excluding the other apostolical books), because in these we find most distinctly and most expressly what suits our condition, and is needful for us to know.—[Wordsworth:—A striking contrast! He who had been stricken with blindness as a persecutor, has now Christ, the Light of the world, revealed in him as a preacher. He who was himself dark, has become a light to others, a light revealing to them Christ.—R.]

On vers. 15 and 16. The grace of God, as free (without any merit of ours) as it is mighty in working—it can change the hearts so fully, that the man throws himself into the directly opposite course. —It is God, who defines our life's course: therefore, courage!—All depends on this, that the Son of God be revealed in us.—The revelation of Christ in us: 1. wherein it consists; 2. how it is brought to pass (only through God's grace); 3. whereto it helps.—Christ, the marrow 1. of all Christian knowledge, 2. of all Christian testimony — God reveals His Son in the hearts of believers, that they may preach Him among the Gentiles. The former attains its purpose only in the latter; the latter has its foundation only in the former.—Every Christian, even without a special call to the ministry, is yet called to preach Christ among the heathen, that is he is called to a steady testimony in deed (and more or less also in word), against all heathen living, to call men back from dead idols to serve the living God.

Ver. 16. Luther: — Herein the Apostle did right. For it would, indeed, have been a godless thing, if he would have had the divine revelation strengthened by man's counsel, like one who doubted thereon. — Starke, after the Berlenb. Bible:—Yet the meaning is not, that we may not hear other people's opinion, yet we are not to give it the *præ*, the upper hand, where God has given His testimony. If the will of God is plain, and if the matter is plain in God's word, there is no need to ask other men for counsel. But if the will of God is yet doubtful, we may well ask good friends for advice; only these advisers must be such as possess the fear of God and wisdom. —Rieger:—Now, as then, the surest course for every one who will find the way of life is, to look alone upon God's commandment, to make the testimonies of the Lord his counsellors, and to hasten thereunto. Without this faithfulness in that which is hidden, the best advice of another may become a temptation and a snare. —Hedinger:—Much doubting and long considering spoils matters. The good will, which God creates, goes to work and does not stand hesitating long.

Divine guidance and human counsel in their right relation to each other.

Ver. 17 sq. Rieger:—God foresaw all that would afterwards be brought against Paul, therefore He so ordered his ways that men could not say: he received his authority from the chief Apostles at Jerusalem; nor yet on the other side: he does not presume to go to Jerusalem; he joins himself with no one. God's good Spirit always brings us out into a plain way.

Even the apparently slight, accidental circumstances of our lives stand under God's direction; if we know it not at the time, yet afterwards we do.

[Ver. 18. Burkitt: — Ministers ought to maintain correspondency and familiarity with each other, in token of their harmony. But though this visit was in the most delightful and desirable, yea most profitable company, yet it was but for *fifteen* days. After the *short* time spent in visiting, we must return to our business, and mind, above all things, our ministerial charge.—R.]

Ver. 20. Starke: — God is a witness of the truth, and a righteous judge of all lies. Can you in all that you say, call on God as the witness of its truth? In all cases this ought to be possible, although it is seldom needful or proper. Ver. 21. It is excellent, when any one, having left his country and his friends, a wicked man, returns back to them again a true child of God. Universities should especially serve this purpose, that those who went to them unconverted youths, should return home converted ones. Ver. 23. It is of God's grace, when from a persecutor and misleader a man becomes a true teacher and confessor. O wonder! Is not that as much as if a dead man were raised to life? And it serves to the praise of the Divine compassion, that the Lord does not destroy His enemies, but wins them over and converts them to his service.—Rieger:—The glory redounding to God from his conversion has wiped out much of the harm of his former course.

When Jesus, here and there again,
His time of grace declares,
That mercy count as thine own gain,
Which others find as theirs.

2. In a subsequent conference in the mother church, he had most definitely guarded the Gospel liberty over against the demands of false brethren; while the Apostles had been fully convinced of his divine mission to preach to the Gentiles, and hence in an entirely free and peaceful agreement a division of the field of labor had been decided upon, and the Gentile world committed to him, without any obligation (respecting doctrine) to the mother church.

(CHAP. ii. 1–10.)

1 Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took
2 Titus with *me* also [also with *me*]. And I went up by revelation, and communi-
cated unto [or laid before] them that [the] gospel which I preach among the Gen-
tiles, but privately to them which were [are] of reputation, lest by any means [per-
3 chance][1] I should run [be running][2] or had [have][3] run, in vain. But neither [not
even] Titus, who was with me, being [though he was][4] a Greek, was compelled to be
4 circumcised: And that because of [the] false brethren unawares [insidiously][5]
brought in, who came in privily [crept in] to spy out our liberty which we have in
5 Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage:[6] To whom we gave place by
subjection [by the submission, *i. e.*, required of us][7] no, not [not even][7] for an hour;
6 that the truth of the gospel might continue with you. But of those who seemed to be
somewhat, [who are of reputation—][8] whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to
me: God accepteth no man's person: for they who seemed *to be somewhat* in conference
added nothing to me: [—to me those who are of reputation imparted[9] nothing]:
7 But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was commit-
ted unto me [that I am entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision],[10] as *the gos-*
8 *pel* of the circumcision *was* unto Peter [as Peter *with that* of the circumcision]: (For
he that wrought effectually [omit effectually] in [for][11] Peter to [toward] the apostle-
ship of the circumcision, the same [omit the same] was mighty in me [wrought for
9 me also] toward the Gentiles;) And when James, Cephas,[12] and John, who seemed to
be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they [and became aware of the
grace that was given unto me, James and Cephas and John, who were esteemed as pil-
lars,][13] gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we *should go*[14] unto
10 the heathen [Gentiles], and they unto the circumcision. Only *they would* that we
should remember the poor; the same which [which very thing][15] I also was for-
ward to do.

[1] Ver. 2.—[On μήπως. See EXEGETICAL NOTES.—R.]

[2] Ver. 2.—[This form of the English present undoubtedly gives the better meaning. So Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot.—R.]

[3] Ver. 2.—["Have" must take the place of "had" for grammatical reasons, "should" being an auxiliary here also.—R.]

[4] Ver. 3.—[The E. V. is literally correct, but does not bring out the reason for his being circumcised, here implied.—R.]

[5] Ver. 4.—[Παρεισάκτους, only here in N. T. It means "insidious," "those foisted in" (Alford, Schaff). It must be rendered adverbially in English.—R.]

[6] Ver. 4.—[The reading of the Rec. καταδουλώσωνται is generally regarded as a correction, since the subjunctive usually follows ἵνα. The future καταδουλώσουσιν is found in ℵ. A. B. C. D. E., and adopted by modern editors.—R.]

Ver. 5.—[Τῇ ὑποταγῇ, a particular submission, that demanded of us.—R.]

[7] Ver. 5.—Οἷς οὐδέ is to be retained with Lachmann, Tischendorf, *etc.* [For this reading there is an immense preponderance of external authority; ℵ. A. B. C. F. K. L. Modern editors all retain it—the omission is easily accounted for. See the extended critical note of Lightfoot on this passage, p. 120 sq.—R.]

[8] Ver. 6.—[Τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι. The idea of "seeming to be somewhat," must give place to that of "being deemed somewhat." So Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot, and most commentators, and E. V. ver. 2. The very strong anacoluthon is rendered more easy by putting ὁποῖοι . . . λαμβάνει, "whatsoever . . . person" in a parenthesis, and placing "to me" in the beginning of the resumptive clause, as indeed is done in the Greek, ἐμοί standing first.—R.]

[9] Ver. 6.—[Προσανέθεντο. Ellicott, "communicated;" Alford, "imparted;" Schaff, "gave no new instruction." See EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[10] Ver. 7—[The structure is altered from the original in the E. V., "I" and "Peter" are the proper subjects of the respective clauses. "Am entrusted with" is a better rendering of πεπίστευμαι, the perfect of permanent state.—R.]

[11] Ver. 8.—[Ἐνεργέω takes ἐν after it, when the meaning is "wrought in;" here it is the simple dative. The E. V. renders the same verb differently in this verse. Literally: "energized," "gave strength to."—R.]

[12] Ver. 9.—D. E. F. G. II. and most of the Fathers have Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος. An inversion to preserve the precedence of rank. Meyer. [The reading Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς is supported by ℵ. B. C. K. L. and adopted by modern editors generally, on internal as well as external grounds.—R.]

[13] Ver. 9.—[The order of the E. V. is an inversion of the original. The true order, given above, is found in Wickliffe's, Tyndale's, Cranmer's, Bishop's and Rhemish, with a slight variation from the above reading. The participle γνόντες is co-ordinate with ἰδόντες (ver. 7). The whole passage should read thus: "When they saw that I am entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, as Peter with that of the circumcision: (For he that wrought for Peter toward the apostleship of the circumcision, wrought for me also toward the Gentiles;) and became aware of the grace that was given

unto me, James and Cephas and John, who were esteemed as pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship."—R.]

[14] Ver. 9.—[Ellicott supplies here "should be apostles," which is objectionable on historical and dogmatical grounds. Schaff: "that we should preach the gospel for."—R].

[15] Ver. 10.—[Ὃ αὐτὸ τοῦτο, is stronger than "the same which." "Which very thing" (Ellicott). Alford more literally: "Which was the very thing that I also was anxious to do."—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Then fourteen years after.**—Is this to be reckoned from the calling of the Apostle, or from his first journey to Jerusalem (chap. i. 18)? At first view we might incline to the latter opinion. But the period of time mentioned chap. i. 18, is unquestionably to be reckoned from the calling, not from the return to Damascus; it is natural, therefore, to do the same here. His calling is the deciding point of time, and Paul wishes to show what he was doing from that time on, how his apostolical activity has its root in the revelation of Christ then given, and not in human instruction. Besides, if it is acknowledged that Paul here does not mean to enumerate his journeys to Jerusalem in an uninterrupted series, but that the journey to the apostolic council is here meant, there is no purpose served in giving the interval between the two journeys; but it might well be of importance to make known how many years he had already spent in his apostolical office. It would be important to know that, having received it at his calling, he had already been long in the exercise of it, when the other Apostles expressed their concurrence with his doctrine. Comp. also Elwert, *Programm* on *Galat.* ii. 1–10. The difficult question, which of the Apostle's journeys to Jerusalem, mentioned in the Acts, is here meant, is too extended to be treated in our present space. Besides, it is of more essential importance for the Acts than for our Epistle. For no one doubts the historical character of the journey mentioned in the Epistle. The result of my investigation is that it was no other than the journey to the apostolic council, that it is not that mentioned Acts xi. 30—since he is not giving an unbroken enumeration—nor that mentioned Acts xviii. 21 (against Wieseler).

[Although this question occupies so large a space in most commentaries on this Epistle, the view given above has been so ably defended latterly, and is now so well established, that a synopsis of the argument and a reference to more extended discussions will be sufficient. The point from which Paul reckons, is his conversion, "being a purely subjective epoch" (Ellicott). Schaff thus states the case: "The Acts mention five journeys after his conversion, *viz.:* 1. ix. 23 (comp. Gal. i. 18), the journey of the year 40, three years after his conversion. 2. xi. 30; xii. 25, the journey during the famine year in 44. 3. xv. 2, the journey to the apostolic council in 50 or 51. 4. xviii. 22, the journey in 54. 5. xxi. 15 (comp. Rom. xv. 25 sq.), the last visit, on which he was made a prisoner and sent to Cæsarea, in 58.

"Of these journeys the first, of course, cannot be meant on account of Gal. i. 18. The second is excluded by the chronological date in ii. 1. For as it took place during the famine of Palestine and in the year in which Herod died, A. D. 44, it would put the conversion of Paul back to the year 30, which is much too early. Some proposed to read four instead of fourteen, but without any critical authority whatever. There is no necessity why Paul should have mentioned this second journey, since it was undertaken simply for the transmission of a collection of the Christians at Antioch for the relief of the brethren in Judea, and not for the purpose of conferring with the Apostles on matters of dispute. In all probability he saw none of them on that occasion, since in that year a persecution raged in which James the elder suffered martyrdom, and Peter was imprisoned. The fifth journey cannot be meant, as it took place after the composition of the Epistle to the Galatians and after the dispersion of the Apostles. Nor can we think of the fourth, which was very short and transient (Acts xviii. 21, 22), leaving no time for such important transactions as are here alluded to; nor was Barnabas with him on that occasion, having separated from Paul some time before (Acts xv. 39).

"We must therefore identify our journey with the third one mentioned in the 15th chapter of Acts. For this took place in 50 or 51, *i. e.*, fourteen years after his conversion (37), and was occasioned by the important controversy on the authority of the law of Moses and the exact relation of the Gentile converts to the Christian church (Acts xv. 2). This visit Paul could not possibly pass over, as it was of the greatest moment to his argument. It is true our passage differs somewhat from the account given by the Acts. But the difference is not irreconcilable. Luke, in keeping with the documentary character of his historical narrative, gives us only the public transactions of the council at Jerusalem; Paul shortly alludes to his personal conference and agreement with the Apostles (ver. 2); both together give us a complete history of that remarkable convention, the first Synod in Christendom, for the settlement of the first doctrinal and practical controversy which agitated the Church." (Schaff, *Comm. in loco.*) See also his *Apostolic Church*, p. 245 sq.; Conyb. and Howson, Vol. I., p. 227 sq.; Meyer and Wordsworth, *in loco;* Alford, Vol. II., *Proleg.*, p. 26; and the valuable note of Lightfoot, p. 122 sq. The authorities in support of this view might be multiplied.—R.]

Ver. 2. **And I went up by revelation.**—Not without design, doubtless, does he bring into view the fact that he went up κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, and so was again deemed worthy of a special revelation from God. He will also remove every thought of his having been, as it were, obliged to present himself before the Apostles, of their having summoned him before them. **Laid before them the gospel**=that which I preach among the Gentiles, namely, that they are justified by faith.—"Them," probably the whole church of Jerusalem.—**But privately to them which are of reputation.**—Besides

having addressed the Christians in Jerusalem generally, he appears to have held separate conferences with those "of reputation." Wieseler's distinction, however, is quite arbitrary; making vers. 3–5 contain the account of his general agreement with the whole church of Jerusalem, and vers. 6–10 the first account of the separate conferences with the Apostles. [ALFORD thinks there was but one conference, making κατ' ἰδίαν δέ limit αὐτοῖς; "when I say 'to them,' I mean privately to those," etc., but the view given above (that of MEYER, ELLICOTT, LIGHTFOOT) is preferable. The general conference is described Acts xv.; "they declared what things God had done with them," (Acts. xv. 4) may refer to these private conferences which probably preceded. The emphasis here is undoubtedly on the private consultations, the result of the public council being already known to the Galatians.—R.] The judgment of "them" [the whole body] is thrown in the background, and he only speaks of "those in reputation," just mentioned; for the fact that he had received *their* acquiescence is what he is opposing to the false teachers. Hence we must regard what is stated in ver. 3, as their judgment also.—Δοκοῦντες, *æstimati*, principal persons. Men of authority; in fact, doubtless, the senior Apostles; especially the three who are named afterwards in ver. 9. He calls them not "Apostles," but δοκοῦντες, "men of repute" because it is as authorities, as those who stood in repute in the Jerusalem church first, but also in the Christian church generally, nay more, were decisive authorities, that they come into consideration. For precisely this is of moment to him, to be able to say to the Galatians that he has been acknowledged by these as an equally authorized Apostle. Of course δοκοῦντες does not in the least imply a disparagement of the Apostles themselves, for it is the church that accords to them this consideration;—the expression conveys a censure upon this estimation in the church only so far as it might imply a failure to recognize his own apostolic dignity. The censures therefore, touched especially this estimation in the sense in which the Apostles were δοκοῦντες for the Galatian false teachers, and in which these turned it to their own account. The censure of this false preference is given prominence in ver. 6, by the addditional phrase "whatsoever they were." Paul cannot intend to dispute in the least that in the right sense the senior Apostles were δοκοῦντες for the Christians. [The force of Paul's expression is weakened by rendering "*were* of reputation," since when he writes, they "*are*" of reputation. hence thus brought into the argument (LIGHTFOOT).—It must be noted also that Paul throughout does not use the word "Apostle." Whether they were Apostles or no, is not evident from anything in the passage, except the mention of James and Cephas and John (ver. 9), and whether that James was either an Apostle or one of the twelve is an open question. Without discussing the point here, it may be suggested that one reason for not calling them "Apostles," was that one of the three "who seemed to be pillars," and "of repute" was not an Apostle, but James the Just, the head of the church at Jerusalem. This will not only explain the omission of the title, but meet subsequent difficulties.—R.]

Lest perchance I should be running or have run in vain.—The sense remains essentially the same, whether we take μήπως as a final particle, or=whether perchance. After the thorough exposition of WIESELER, however, the latter is to be preferred. (So also MEYER in 4th ed.) Of course, however, he does not mean to say that he himself was doubtful about it. This would have been in conflict with the whole purpose of his detailed account, and would have represented him as dependent on the Senior Apostles. He wished only, on account of the antagonists of his teaching, to obtain from the Apostles, on whose authority these supported themselves, a confirmation of this teaching, in order to cut off every pretext from his opponents. "Run in vain"=labor to no purpose, *operam perdere*. This would have been the case, if Paul had actually proclaimed a false doctrine, with which the senior Apostles could not agree. The outward success of his preaching is not primarily in view, though we may conclude from ver. 7, 8, 9, that he spoke of this also. Others take μήπως as a final particle, and interpret as follows: in order not *to appear* as one who was running or had run, in vain, as might have been the case, if I had not submitted my gospel to examination, had its harmony with Apostles established; but the idea of "appearing" is extraneous to the passage. [For a clear discussion of the grammatical and exegetical difficulties of this clause, see ELLICOTT, *in loco*. Whatever view be adopted, we must not concede that Paul had any doubt about his Gospel. The conditional μήπως is probably used to indicate respect for those in reputation at Jerusalem. The doubt could only concern the opinion of others, which by being opposed, might render his labors in vain.—R.] In what follows he says that he received the desired acquiescence on the part of the Apostles. He does not however at once declare this, but mentions a special circumstance, which implies it in a striking manner.

Vers. 3. **But not even Titus.**—The sense is clear: οὐδέ points to a thought to be supplied. "I laid frankly before them, how I preach among the Gentiles; not concealing that I do not at all hold them to the keeping of the law, to the receiving of circumcision—and now, according to the representation of the false teachers, it was to be expected that they would appear in opposition to me; but (ἀλλά) so far was this from being the case, so far from declaring this doctrine false [or, connecting it with the last clause, so far from my having run in vain—R.], not even with respect to Titus, a born Gentile, who had come to Jerusalem, to the very mother of the Jewish Christian churches with me, was the demand made that he should be circumcised, though it might readily have been, when Jewish prejudice was so greatly offended by his uncircumcision." Still less did they censure the doctrine of Paul, or demand of him that he should preach the necessity of circumcision among the Gentile Christians as a body. The case has been thoroughly perplexed by bringing in, in direct contradiction to what the words say, the thought, that the Apostles had wished, or even demanded, the cir-

cumcision of Titus; but that Paul and Titus had set themselves against their desire. ELWERT justly remarks, *Programm*, p. 10: *Quid enim ineptius dici potest quam illud: tantum abfuit, ut apostoli causam meam improbarent, ut ne Titus quidem illis contraria petentibus obsequeretur?* [The word ἠναγκάσθη seems to imply that there was a demand made for the circumcision of Titus, not by the Apostles, but by the false brethren (ver. 4). Had the idea been merely, that the circumcision was not even demanded, so strong a word would not have been used. There is some force in the suggestion of LIGHTFOOT, that the Apostles recommended Paul to yield as a charitable concession, but convinced at length that he was right, they gave him their support. Still we have not sufficient knowledge of the circumstances to decide whether Paul cites this as an evidence of the Apostles' agreement with him or of his firmness—in all probability it is both. Not even Titus, of whom as a Greek the false brethren made the demand, was required to submit—or whom as a Greek I would not allow to be circumcised, since this would have been a giving up of the whole matter. The preceding context suggests the former, the subsequent context the latter side of the occurrence. On the reasons for the non-circumcision of Titus, and the circumcision of Timothy (Acts xvi. 2), see DOCTRINAL NOTES.—R.]

Ver. 4. **And that because of the false brethren.**—What is to be supplied with "because of the false brethren?" After an examination of all the views presented, it appears to me that we can only say: we do not and cannot know, since Paul has broken off the sentence, and all attempts to fill it out are hazardous, from the danger of introducing foreign matter. The mention of the ψευδάδελφοι is very intelligible. He has already indicated the concurrence of the Apostles by reference to the striking case of Titus, or at least, negatively, that they did not oppose him. But before he says anything definite, positive, respecting this concurrence (ver. 6 sq), he mentions his opposers, who did not concur, who attacked him and his teaching, and had also especially occasioned his journey to Jerusalem. The mention of the false brethren, however, stirs his displeasure, so that he does not complete the thought begun, but first by a brief and fit phrase, describes his opposers, and then falling out of the construction, continues with οἷς, and expresses the thought, which probably he had in mind in mentioning the "false brethren," namely, that he had not in the least yielded to them. In what he did not yield, is not expressed; probably to their demands, in general, respecting the obligation of the Gentile Christians to keep the law. Not till he has first established this negative result does he revert to the action of the δοκοῦντες, and he now relates the positive acknowledgment, which he had from them.—If we seek a complement to διά, three suggest themselves. (1), ἀνέβην—(EWALD, substantially). According to this, as he cannot pass over the remoter cause of his journey, namely, the intrigues of the Pharisees, the same party that had now of late again persecuted him so bitterly, he begins in ver. 4, anew, as it were, the account of this journey.—Ordinarily, however, the complement is sought in the foregoing sentence, because the somewhat abrupt character of this was rather perplexing, and its contents appeared to require the statement of a reason. This view took δέ usually as epexegetical, and therefore supplied (2) οὐκ ἠναγκάσθη, which, in fact, strongly commends itself; simply, however, in the sense: Now, this took place on account of the "false brethren," that is, it was even on account of these. that the Christians in Jerusalem, particularly the Apostles, did not urge it upon him, lest, by yielding to them, the opinion that circumcision was necessary, should receive sanction. This contains the implied thought, that in itself they would not unwillingly have seen him circumcised, but that now, for the sake of principle, they did not press it. But this makes it necessary, first to ascribe to the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem a way of thinking, which is not ascribed to them in this chapter, but expressly limited to individuals, "false brethren," in order afterwards to find it impossible that they should have abstained from all demands for circumcising Titus, *on account of* these "false brethren." Whether the "false brethren" demanded particularly the circumcision of Titus, is not said. On the other hand, if we complete the sentence thus, the sense is inadmissible, that *Paul*, precisely on account of the false brethren, opposed himself to a demand to have Titus circumcised, from whomever it proceeded. This alters the plain meaning of ver. 3; ἠναγκάσθη receives the sense: the constraint, which it was attempted to exercise, was frustrated; and especially οὐδέ, and the implied thought to which it points, is quite neglected. Then we should have this absurdity: "so far were they from disapproving my teaching, that I or Titus did not even yield when his circumcision was demanded." If this demand is referred to the Apostles, the thought is completely inverted (*see* above), but even if it is referred only to the "false brethren," it is none the less impossible. And the case remains the same, if, instead of "he was not compelled," we supply "he was not circumcised," still explaining it, "*I* or *we*, on account of the false brethren, did not consent, when it was desired." Finally, (3) "He was circumcised," is supplied (δέ therefore being taken adversatively), and in its turn defended by ELWERT, *Programm*, with much acuteness. And, in fact, if we must fill out the sentence, I should be most disposed to declare for this. It especially commends itself by the light which it throws both upon ver. 3 and upon ver. 11. For, beyond question, it remains somewhat enigmatical, why he instances so particularly this one fact of refusing to circumcise Titus, hastening to it even before he has spoken, on the positive side, of the reception of his preaching in Jerusalem. The reproach (ver. 11) then remains not altogether intelligible. On the other hand, all is easily explained, if we assume that Titus was then circumcised. That is, many founded upon this the allegation that he commended circumcision. But especially was this circumstance urged, in order to deduce therefrom, that his teaching had been disapproved by the Apostles, and that he had yielded to these. Therefore, he declares at once: It is not even true, as is commonly related, that Titus was constrained to receive circumcision. Titus was circumcised, not upon a requisition of

the Apostles, but voluntarily by me, solely on account of the false brethren insidiously brought in, that they might not, making a handle of his being uncircumcised, prepossess the Christians in Jerusalem against me, and dispose them to a resolution unfavorable for the Gentile Christians. "*Quare eandem, quam semper et in omnibus normam secutus, ne quid detrimenti capiat res Christiana, suæ libertatis minime tenax illorum se voluntati submittit, imbecillioribus servit. Neutiquam fratrum irreptitiorum habita ratione hoc fecit, sed eos respiciens, quos, quum fidei infirma ac judicii parum subacti essent, illorum insectationibus objectos videret. Circumcisione Titi permissa insidias hominum malignorum evitavit, animos imbecilliorum sibi conciliavit apostolus.*" ELWERT, p. 13. This interpretation is only apparently in conflict with ver. 5. Nay, ELWERT remarks that only so does τῇ ὑποταγῇ find its true explanation; for that only the following translation is natural: to whom not even for an hour did we yield by the submission: "*obsequium se præstitisse Paulus profitetur, sed non ita præstitisse, ut illis se victum daret vel de jure suo aliquid cederet.*" For he provided that the truth of the Gospel should remain with the Gentile Christians. Of course, he could not yield to the circumstances of the time, without, at the same time, giving a testimony to the evangelical truth, whereby this was maintained in its integrity. This explanation of τῇ ὑποταγῇ, however, awakens some misgiving; could Paul well admit a "ὑποταγή" towards the ψευδάδελφοι? Is not this expression too strong? We are tempted, therefore, even admitting this explanation of διά, *etc.*, to join τῇ ὑποταγῇ to the negation, making Paul say that an εἴκειν τῇ ὑποταγῇ nevertheless did not take place, even if their behavior occasioned him to have Titus circumcised.

[As LIGHTFOOT well remarks: "The counsels of the Apostles of the circumcision are the hidden rock on which the grammar of the sentence is wrecked," but because the grammar is wrecked on this hidden rock, it is not necessary to wreck Paul's facts and arguments and even principles, on a rock so easily avoided as the theory of ELWERT advanced above. In fact, as MEYER remarks, such conduct "would have been unprincipled and wrong." That is an all-sufficient objection. As regards what should be supplied, it is most naturally taken from the preceding verse, to which our verse then refers, δέ being explicative. Whether "he was not compelled," or "he was not circumcised," is open to discussion. The first implies that "those of reputation" did not compel it on this account; the other, that the thing was not done, either because Paul would not thus surrender a principle, or "those of reputation" thought it were best not to do it. As this latter does not imply any definite counsel of the other Apostles—the very point about which there is greatest doubt—it is on the whole safer to adopt it.—R.]

Ψευδάδελφοι (also 2 Cor. xi. 26), comp. ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδοπροφῆται, are in general, brethren, fellow-Christians, who bear this name unworthily; specifically, because they, on account of their Judaizing opinions, especially on the necessity of circumcision for Christians, are properly still Jews. So WIESELER. Yet this in itself hardly suffices to explain the strong ψευδο (and especially the παρείσακτοι and παρεισῆλθον), but we must add to it their behavior towards the other Christians, the utterly unbrotherly hateful opposition (not shrinking indeed from intrigues and slanders), which they maintained against the freer evangelical views. The complete definition of "false brethren" is given in "spy out," "bring us into bondage;" they do not yet stand in the freedom which there is in Christ; nay, more they wish to deprive others also of it; nay, more, they exercise a system of espionage against these. The false teachers in Galatia were essentially such people, perhaps they were emissaries of those in Jerusalem; and on this account it is with special purpose that their conduct in Jerusalem, and their discomfiture, are mentioned. But the Galatian teachers themselves are not meant here; this would be entirely foreign to the context.—A more particular notice respecting these people is given Acts xv. 5, whatever judgment may be held of the general relation of the present chapter to Acts xv. They were, according to this, persons of the sect of the Pharisees, who, it is true, had come to believe on Jesus, that He was the Christ, but had not given up their Nomism and Ergism, and, therefore, doubtless were so much the more hostile to their former fellow-Pharisee, Paul, on account of his present position, so sharply anti-Pharisaic. Holding fast, as they thus did, essentially, to their Pharisaism, it is easy to understand that their belief in Christ had as yet produced in them few effects of moral transformation. The article describes the persons as the Pharisaical Christians, historically known to the readers; either the particular individuals were known, or, at all events, this sort of people, since the Galatian false teachers were of the same class.

[**Insidiously brought in.**—LIGHTFOOT:—"The metaphor is that of spies or traitors introducing themselves by stealth into the enemy's camp. The camp is the Christian Church. Pharisees at heart, these traitors assume the name and garb of believers." He thus paraphrases: "The agitators, who headed the movement, were no true brethren, no loyal soldiers of Christ. They were spies, who had made their way into the camp of the gospel under false colors, and were striving to undermine our liberty in Christ, to reduce us again to bondage." WORDSWORTH:—"By mentioning these, he clears the holy Apostles from the imputation of being supposed to have been parties to such a requisition, as that Titus, a Gentile, should be compelled to be circumcised."—R.] "What is already indicated in the composite ψευδάδελφοι is, by the predicate παρείσακτοι, interchanging immediately after with παρεισῆλθον, brought forward with especial emphasis. They are called παρείσακτοι, because they have pressed in on one side of the entrance; that is, by a forbidden way, *sc.* into the Christian church, and, therefore, do not properly belong to it. Παρείσακτοι and παρεισῆλθον are doubtless to be applied to these alone, and not to an outward insinuation of themselves into a single church (for instance, that of Antioch), in order there to oppose Paul. Comp. Acts xv."—WIESELER. Of course, they did the latter also; it was closely connected with their having insinuated themselves into the Christian Church. But here, doubtless, the pri-

mary reference is only to their appearance in Jerusalem itself. A local interpretation of παρείσακτοι and παρεισῆλθον is the less necessary, as parallel expressions are found: παρεισάγειν, 2 Pet. ii. 1, and παρεισδύειν, Jude 4, where the reference is clearly to the Christian Church in general. **Who crept in to spy out.**—The immediate purpose of their "creeping in" in itself was hardly "to spy out" the liberty of others; but what they did made their coming in (εἰσέρχεσθαι) a "creeping in" (παρεισέρχεσθαι) whose purpose could only be regarded as this "spying out." "The false brethren are thus characterized according to their common dangerousness to Christian liberty, in order to give the reason why Paul could not yield to such false brethren."—WIESELER.

Two things are laid to their charge: first, a "spying out of" **our liberty**;—they lie in ambush for our liberty, spy out in what we show ourselves freemen, turn their notice to that, but with hostile intent; therefore, how widely removed from brotherly love! Then, in the second place, they seek to reënslave the free, *i. e.*, they demand of them to give up their freedom. By the freedom which we have in Christ Jesus is primarily meant freedom from the Mosaic law, from its ritual ordinances, and especially therefore from circumcision. The wider, deeper meaning of this freedom is involved in this, but here, doubtless, not primarily in view. "Our liberty." Whose? Certainly it does refer to Paul merely, but yet primarily only to those who understood the freedom in Christ, and availed themselves of it, and these without exception. But as Paul no doubt vindicates this standing fast in freedom as at least a right of all Christians, and regards the "false brethren" with their views and their conduct as in truth no Christians, the "we," in point of fact, embraces all Christians, the Gentile Christians, of course, and also the Jewish Christians, so far as these were not "false brethren."—**In Jesus Christ**, as being found in him. [SCHAFF:—"In living union with Him who is the end of the law (Rom. x. 4). This is the positive side of freedom."—ELLICOTT:—Not "through Christ," a meaning it may bear, but in the fuller and deeper sense "in Christ."—R.]—**That they might bring us into bondage**:—that is, under the law. On this account, also, the reading καταδουλώσωνται=make us *their* servants, is to be rejected, and καταδουλώσουσιν to be read, which is better attested than the subjunctive—σωσιν.

Ver. 5. **To whom we gave place by the submission, no, not even for an hour.**—Here "we" unquestionably, takes on a more restricted sense =I, Paul, probably also Titus himself, and Barnabas. This narrowing of the sense will appear arbitrary to no one. For here the reference is to a single, definite transaction, where Paul can have in mind only the individuals who had part in it: it is somewhat different with "freedom in Christ." The yielding is still more strongly designated by ὑποταγῇ. (Comp. the different interpretation of ELWERT above, ver. 4.)

This decided refusal to yield had been adequately explained by the foregoing characterization of the pseudo-brethren; it is now given again; **that the truth of the gospel might continue**.—For yielding would have represented Christian freedom as void, and would have overturned the truth of the gospel, on which it is founded.—**With you**; in itself, doubtless, signifying with the Gentile Christians generally—nay, more, with all Christians; but Paul "individualizes the matter, with reference to those to whom he writes." For it concerned him to bring home to them, that even at that time he had guarded the benefit of Christian freedom for them, in order to show in what contradiction their present behavior stood with this fact, since they themselves were now abjuring this benefit.

Ver. 6. **But of those who are of reputation.**—To the pseudo-brethren he now opposes "those of repute." The former he withstood, from the latter he received no instruction implying disapprobation of his teaching. Ver. 6 is an anacoluthon, his language being somewhat disturbed in the thoughts of the presumption and deceit with which the Galatian false teachers had elevated the "δοκοῦντες" above him, and had vindicated the apostolic authority of the former only, denying it to him. He begins as if he would subjoin an οὐδὲν ἔλαβον. But the remark respecting the δοκεῖν εἶναί τι leads him away from this, and he continues with another verb, afterwards resuming δοκοῦντες, and giving at the same time the grounds of the parenthetical statements. EWALD, on the contrary, however, joins οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει with ἀπὸ τῶν δοκ.=compared with these, however high they stood, I am in nothing inferior. It is difficult to justify this grammatically. "Of reputation."—See above, ver. 2. The main idea implied in δοκοῦντες, used absolutely, is here clearly expressed by the addition εἶναί τι=to be something great, to be of some account; with what incidental meaning, see above.—**Whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me.**—On the one hand Paul has emphasized the consideration in which the Apostles stood, because it was of moment to him to be able to say, that he had been acknowledged even by these. Yet this might be misunderstood, hence the parenthesis. He emphasizes only for the sake of his readers. To him, on his own account, "it makes no difference in how high authority soever they stood;" as respected him, they did not come into consideration as δοκοῦντες, they asserted no authority: **to me they imparted nothing**. This exaltation of individuals=the Apostles, in such a way as to throw the authority of Paul into the shade, rests entirely upon mere human judgment. God's census does not rank them thus: **God accepteth no man's person.**—He makes no such distinction, to Him the senior Apostles are not "of repute" in contrast with Paul; he has chosen Paul to be an Apostle as much as them. And, he continues, I have a right so to speak, for those "of repute" demeaned themselves altogether agreeably to this divine valuation, and did not undertake to instruct me. [The E. V., "in conference added nothing to me," gives the commonly received interpretation of the verb προςανέθεντο: "gave no new or additional instruction." But notwithstanding the authority for such a rendering, it does not seem to be justified by the use of the word (MEYER, ALFORD, ELLICOTT). The idea of imposing burdens is obviously inadmissible.—R.]

It is most simple to refer the ποτέ to the lifetime of Jesus=it signifies nothing to me that they enjoyed the immediate, confidential intercourse of Jesus, while I did not. For it was on this that the Judaizers founded special preëminence which they attributed to the other Apostles over Paul. Others: then in Jerusalem; which is less probable. [The point in question respecting ποτέ is: has it a temporal reference in the sense of *olim*, formerly (either during our Lord's lifetime or then in Jerusalem), or does it simply render ὁποῖοι more general and inclusive, having the force of *cunque*. The latter is classical, but the N. T. usage is disputed. Since it is not said anywhere that these "of repute" were Apostles, who enjoyed immediate intercourse with the Lord, the latter is, on the whole, preferable, as giving a wider signification to δοκοῦντες. "Were" may mean in the past from the time of narration or of the incident narrated; the latter is more probable if ποτέ is taken as referring to intercourse with the Lord during His lifetime.—R.]

Ver. 7. **When they saw that I am entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision.**—Naturally, "gospel" of course means here (comp. πεπίστ. and ver. 8) an official activity of the Apostle, therefore not the gospel as to its contents, but the evangelical preaching, τὸ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, as often. The genitives, "of the uncircumcision," "of the circumcision," are therefore *gen. obj.*=preaching of the gospel among the uncircumcision, or the circumcision; ver. 8 exchanges it for "apostleship of the circumcision," and as εἰς τὰ ἔθνη (vers. 8, 9) shows that the abstracts "uncircumcision," "circumcision," stand for the concretes—Jews, Heathen. That here we are not to suppose two gospels different in character, the Gospel of the Uncircumcision, and the Gospel of the Circumcision, of which the latter maintained the necessity of circumcision, while the former let it drop (BAUR), but only two different circles of hearers of the same gospel, may be regarded as self-evident to the unprejudiced reader.* Peter appears as the representative of the Apostles to the Jews, because he especially had hitherto labored as such. Afterwards, however, the two other Apostles, James and John, are designated, with Peter, as Apostles for the Jews (ver. 9. αὐτοὶ δέ). "That Peter had a Gentile Christian vocation also (Acts xv. 7) is not denied, but *a parte potiori fit denominatio.*"—MEYER. The converse applies to Paul. In ver. 9 Barnabas also appears conjointly with him, as Gentile Apostle. [It must be noted that while Paul uses the word "apostleship" in ver. 8, with reference to himself and Peter, he does not use it or anything to the same purport in ver. 9, where James and Barnabas are spoken of. The same is true of the whole passage. There is no evidence of the apostleship of James or Barnabas in this whole Epistle, whatever the probabilities may be. See notes on ver. 9.—R.] "Entrusted;"† Supply: By God through Christ —agreeably to the proof of this affirmation rendered in ver. 8. For from what facts did they perceive what is said in ver. 7 respecting the different mission of each? Primarily from what follows in ver. 8 (γάρ).

Ver. 8. **For he that wrought effectually for Peter.**—From the fact that God had been *operative for Peter* in the one, and for Paul in the other direction, they concluded that God had given to the one the one, and to the other the other *vocation.* How far now was God operative for one and the other?—MEYER, WIESELER:—"He furnished them forth for the apostolic office, with illumination and endowments, gave them the χαρίσματα of an Apostle." (Comp. Acts xv. 12: God did miracles and wonders by them among the Gentiles.) True, it is certainly not merely these endowments themselves that are referred to, but also and especially what they did in virtue of the same, the beginning and result of their activity, wherein God's "working" was recognized. What immediately follows in ver. 9: **and became aware of the grace that was given unto me,** [unfortunately misplaced in E. V.—R.] undoubtedly also refers to the outfit for the apostolic office by means of charisms, yet it is most naturally referred mainly to the success of their preaching. Precisely from this they perceived how highly endowed Paul was. They first inferred his equal apostolic calling from the "grace given," hence the calling itself cannot be meant. [Yet what more natural than that Paul should mean: "they recognize my calling, because they perceive that I was called by grace." The main reference may be to the success, but the perception of the calling through the grace given, is not to be excluded. On the two participles ἰδόντες and γνόντες, LIGHTFOOT says: "the former describes the *apprehension* of the outward tokens of his commission, as evinced by his successful labors; the latter the *conviction* arrived at in consequence that the grace of God was with him."—R.]

Ver. 9. **James and Cephas and John.**—"James." Is this one identical with James the Lord's brother, chap. i. 19? The fact that there the additional appellation is expressly given, while it is lacking here, does not, of course, disprove the identity. Inasmuch as James had already been just mentioned as "the Lord's brother," if the same one is meant this special designation might be omitted here. The main question is: Could the James, whom Paul names in this passage, have been other than an Apostle? And this question we shall always be inclined to answer negatively. In itself it would be very intelligible, that a brother of the Lord converted to the faith, although not an Apostle, might have attained an eminent position in the church of Jerusalem. But, considering how plainly our Epistle itself brings to view the strong emphasis laid by the Jewish Christians on an immediate inauguration into the apostolate by Christ, would it have been probable that such a one, not an Apostle, would have been reckoned by these among the "pillars," "those of reputation?" And if one not an Apostle had enjoyed so eminent an estimation as a "pillar" (James being here placed even before Peter), could they then have so strongly charged upon Paul a want of parity with the senior Apostles? And would he then have found it necessary to prove his equality with such strength of asser-

* [TERTULLIAN; *Non separationem evangelii, nec ut* aliud *alter sed ut* aliis *alter prædicassent.*—R.]

† [Notice the exact use of the perfect πεπίστευμαι, "I have been, I am still entrusted with it."—R.]

tion as he does in Gal. i.? James, the Lord's brother also lacks this parity, and could claim it even less than Paul, since he could not appeal to any immediate revelation and calling [? comp. 1 Cor. xv. 7.—R.], and Paul certainly would not have omitted bringing this forward, thereby to invalidate the reasoning of his opponents. These are substantially WIESELER's arguments. We must then either take James the Lord's brother as identical with James, the son of Alpheus, and therefore himself an Apostle (a view already rejected in commenting on chap. i. 19), or take the James of this passage as a different one, *i. e.* the son of Alpheus and not the Lord's brother. That the James in question occupied a certain official position as chief pastor in the church of Jerusalem is justly inferred from the precedence of his name here and also from ver. 12. This on the other hand accords well with the special prominence given to Peter, vers. 7, 8. In reference to proper apostolic activity, in missionary activity, Peter precedes James.

[We are again confronted with this difficult question respecting James. On the theory of the identity of James Alphaei and James, the Lord's brother, all difficulty vanishes here, as well as in Acts xv., and for this reason it is adopted by many. The view, that there were other Apostles besides the Twelve and Paul, avoids both the other difficulties, but is on other grounds very objectionable. We are to reconcile the view advanced i. 19 (that there were two prominent men named James, one the son of Alpheus and an Apostle, the other James the Lord's brother, who was not an Apostle) with this passage. Which is referred to here? Schmoller, following WIESELER, says, the former, to which view objection must now be made. 1. The James here referred to was the head of the church at Jerusalem. Such a position is ascribed to the Lord's brother, to James the Just; if he cannot be identified with the son of Alpheus, the son of Alpheus is not referred to here. 2. This position over the church of Jerusalem, so obviously implied here, does not necessarily imply that James was an Apostle. For with respect to missionary activity Peter stands first, with respect to the church at Jerusalem this James. Was not missionary work distinctively apostolic work? was not one not an Apostle more likely to be in a permanent position at Jerusalem? 3. Paul does not call these three. Apostles, any more than he calls Barnabas an Apostle. In fact all the way through he uses a term that is indefinite—"of reputation." If he meant Apostles only and wished to show his agreement with the senior Apostles, he would hardly have so carefully avoided saying so.—"Those in repute" were esteemed in Galatia as well as Jerusalem, and he was defending himself against Judaizers, who while denying his apostleship, quoted against him the *mother church* as well as the college of the Apostles. Hence he speaks of "the pillars" of the church then and there, not of Apostles as such, and puts them in the order of precedence in that church, "James and Peter and John." Had all of them been of the Twelve, and as such recognized his apostleship (for these three gave him the right hand of fellowship), how could James' name come first? Any argument proving James to have done this as a distinctively apostolic act proves too much: proves him to be the head of the apostolic college. It is as head of that church, whence the Judaizing influence in Galatia came, that he takes precedence. Therefore we identify this James with the Lord's brother (so in ver. 12).—R.]

Who were esteemed as pillars=as supports of the Christian church. Christ, of course, is the foundation. The Christian world is viewed as an *οἰκοδομή*.

They gave—the right hands of fellowship.—In general=They concluded with me and Barnabas an agreement as formal and firm as it was amicable. The more precise sense is given by the preceding context, inasmuch as this agreement was founded upon that. Seeing the coöperation (*ἐνεργεῖν*) of God rendered to both Peter and Paul, they had become persuaded of the equal *divine* vocation of *each*, of the former to the preaching of the gospel among the Gentiles, of the latter to the preaching of the gospel among the Jews. To this clearly recognized divine will they now rendered obedience by the formation of this compact. Agreeably to this twofold vocation they regulated also the twofold activity; assigning formally to each the field of labor to which, as they had become convinced, he was called. This was, it is true, a division of the work, but in the consciousness that it was a common work of preaching the gospel, one in God, who had only assigned to one this post, and to the other that. Therefore they gave "right hands of *fellowship.*" [LIGHTFOOT: "gave pledges." "The outward gesture is lost sight of in this expression, as appears from the fact that the plural is often used of a single person."—R.] It was to be a parallel but a coöperative activity. The assumption of BAUR therefore is entirely untenable, that it had only been a purely *external* compromise, that the senior Apostles after as before had held firmly the necessity of circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic law to salvation; that for the mission to the Gentiles they had tolerated Paul's so widely divergent principles, because they could not prevent them, but that a further, inner bond between Paul's mission to the Gentiles, and their mission to the Jews, did not exist. This would make "gave the right hands of fellowship" signify nothing more than, to come to an agreement and indeed really to an agreement to separate.*

That we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the Circumcision.—The *purpose* of the words, according to the connection, is doubtless to point out, that in this act the acknowledgment of the parity of Paul, and particularly the approbation of his teaching, was expressed in the strongest manner. So far were the senior Apostles from demanding a change in his teaching, that by this fixed compact they gave a full sanction to it, and declared in the most unequivocal manner, that they held it to be a pure gospel and worthy

*[For a compact survey of the transactions narrated in this section, see SCHAFF, *Apostolic church*, p. 249 sq.—for a valuable note against BAUR's hypotheses, p. 251 sq.—For a very thoughtful and interesting sketch of the relations between Jewish and Gentile Christianity in the first ages of the church, against the advocates of a distinctive Pauline Christianity, the reader is referred to LIGHTFOOT, *Dissertation iii. Paul and the Three*, p. 283 sq.—R.]

to be preached. For otherwise they would not have been able so composedly to make over the Gentile world to Paul as his mission field. To the general purpose of the statement the added clause "only," etc., (ver. 10) also contributes. One wish, to be sure, they had respecting Paul and Barnabas; which, however, related in no way to a change of doctrine, implied no obligation toward the "circumcision," concerning doctrine, but was only an entreaty to remember the poor. But the meaning and purpose of this added clause is not, that this was the only limitation of the separation here coming to light (BAUR). In practice, modifications of this partition of the field of labor arose, especially to Paul, in consequence of the Jews of the dispersion. The partition therefore is to be understood not so much ethnographically as geographically. (Comp. also ver. 10, where "the poor" means poor people in Judea, and, therefore, "circumcision" here in contrast with the Gentile countries is also Judea.)

Ver. 10. **Remember the poor**:—of course by gifts. As to the cause of the poverty of the Christians in Judea there are different conjectures.—**Which very thing.**—Paul studiously brings this forward in order to strengthen the contrast between the Jewish Christian opposition to him, and his approved zeal and affection for the Jewish Christians.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The significance of this event.* On the significance, with respect to Christian doctrine and the Christian Church, of the proceedings between the Apostle Paul and the Christians in Jerusalem, especially the senior Apostles, since the proceedings themselves are not here detailed, the reader is referred to Acts xv. and to the remarks of Lechler *in loco*, LANGE'S *Comm. Acts*, p. 282 sq. Only this need be said here; by the acknowledgment of the "liberty in Christ Jesus," an emancipation from the old Covenant was for the first time effected; it was authoritatively established that a new Covenant was come, and Christianity was recognized as the absolutely perfect and the universal religion. Even though it was Paul who first brought this truth, in theory and practice, to its just validity, it was not, by any means, merely his own subjective view to such an extent as to make of Christianity something else than what it was, or was meant to be, in itself. This appears in the clearest light from his representation. Doubtless there were not a few who imputed this to him, and, therefore, were passionately hostile to the rise of his influence ("pseudo-brethren"), Jewish Christians, who were as yet more Jews than Christians. Against these Paul had to combat, and to what extent is shown, not only in our Epistle, but also in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. But precisely those whose voice was most availing ("those of repute"), and who, at the same time, best knew what was Christ's true mind and purpose, frankly concurred with Paul were one with him, and with them certainly all who had *really* become disciples of Christ, and, in the power of the Holy Ghost, had overcome all Pharisaic leanings, or had never had them. And although they for themselves did not stand upon that point of the "liberty in Christ Jesus" represented by Paul, yet these only needed a setting forth, on the part of Paul, of his preaching among the Gentiles, and of the argument inhering in the fact of its success, to convince them, in the first place of the possibility, in the case of the Gentiles, of being saved through faith in Christ alone. Comp. respecting Peter, Gal. ii. 16; moreover, his course, Acts x., his justification of it, Acts xi.; must not the other Apostles then have been prepared by the latter for the report rendered by Paul, Acts xv.? Therefore, that chapter and Gal. ii., do not at all make the impression that they might still have had an opposite opinion and only now gave it up; and, of course, not the impression that they yet retained their antagonistic opinion, and yielded only externally. And even if they, and with them, the greater part of the Jewish Christians emancipated themselves only partially and gradually from a personal observance of the law, yet with that admission respecting the Gentiles, the principle of Christianity was acknowledged, it was acknowledged that a new Covenant had come, founded upon Christ alone.—There existed a *consensus apostolorum* on this question of principle: shall we have Law and the old Covenant or Christ and the new Covenant? This, thank God, is securely guaranteed, and the *dissensus*, which is said to have arisen between the original Apostles, as contracted Judaizers, and Paul, the man of Progress, is a discovery of modern criticism, which views testimony so plain as that of our chapter, and of Acts xv., only through the glass of its own preconceptions.

2. *Liberty in Christ.* In opposition to the pseudo-brethren, Paul, in the interest of the truth of the gospel, indicates the "liberty in Christ," with the utmost decision, and will not be brought into bondage. On the other hand, where the truth of the gospel is not at stake, Paul scruples not of his own accord to make himself the servant of all, and for the sake of gaining souls (1 Cor. ix. 19, 20) renounces "liberty." The rule herein contained for the conduct of the Christian is clear; he may not bind his conscience by a human ordinance, which passes itself off for a commandment of God, nor permit it to be imposed upon him as a condition of salvation; but he not only may, but ought to, make himself a servant, to bind himself, to make something a duty of conscience to himself, for the sake of a weak brother. But because he does this of free will, in thus "becoming a servant," he most shows his freedom, he does it as freeman, and remains clearly conscious of the distinction between God's commandment and man's ordinance. The rule in itself is clear, but demands much wisdom in its practical applications.

3. [*Titus and Timothy.* The principle just stated can best be illustrated by a reference to the Apostle's conduct in this case of Titus and that of Timothy (Acts xvi. 3) subsequently. WORDSWORTH thus judiciously states the difference: "If Timothy was circumcised (as was probably well known in Galatia), why not Titus? If not Titus, why Timothy? St. Paul replies to this question here: 'But not even he who was with me at *Jerusalem*, being a *Gentile*, was compelled to be circumcised.' I would not consent that he should be circumcised, even at Jerusalem. I do not consent to your

circumcision,—*because* you are *Gentiles*, and because you have embraced the *gospel*, and because it would be to force you backwards, instead of forwards, if I compelled you, or permitted others to compel you, to submit to the Levitical Law. But Timothy's case was very different from yours. As has been well said by Augustine, St. Paul circumcised *Timothy*, in order that Timothy's mother and maternal friends might not imagine that he *detested* circumcision, as if it were an idolatrous thing; for circumcision was from God, but Idolatry is of the Devil. But he did not circumcise *Titus*, lest he should afford a handle to those who alleged that Gentiles, receiving the gospel, could not be served without circumcision; and who deceived the Gentile Christians by imputing such an opinion to St. Paul. He might perhaps have allowed even Titus to receive circumcision, as a thing *indifferent*, and for the sake of peace and charity. But these false brethren did not proffer circumcision as a thing indifferent, but as *necessary*. Observe 1) His *charity*, in circumcising *Timothy* at Lystra, in condescension to the scruples of *weak* brethren. 2) His *courage* in refusing to circumcise *Titus* at *Jerusalem*, in submission to the requisitions of *false* brethren. He would be tender-hearted to the erring, but he would not make the least compromise with error; and he would make no concession to any who would impose their errors on others as terms of communion."—R.]

4. *The importance of Paul's position.* Paul emphasizes so decidedly the fact that the senior Apostles gave him no new instruction, but recognized him as of equal authority, not out of pride, but in order to establish the truth of his preaching of the gospel, and the title by which he exercised the apostleship. He does it in the same spirit as in chap. 1; he declares that he did not receive his gospel from man.—Paul is protesting, in fact, against the beginnings of a Papacy, which the "false brethren" wished to erect by exaggerating the authority of the "Pillar Apostles" (and probably of Peter especially), as something to which a Paul must accommodate himself, as having no commission independently of it. "The authority of the pillars," however, was only a pretext, the rallying word that they used; their own authority was what they sought.—Heubner.

[The authority of the "Mother Church" seems, from the drift of Paul's narrative, to have been the rallying cry rather than the authority of Peter, since, in the sentence which establishes the acquiescence of the "pillars," the name of James stands first. The argument gains force as a protest in this view (especially if James were not one of the Twelve). For the essence of Papacy is not the primacy of Peter, that was just such a pretext as the Galatians used, but the infallible authority of a Mother-Church. Therefore, the ground on which Paul stands is the basis for other protests than the famous one of the 16th century, since the insisting upon things indifferent as necessary is not confined to one Pope at Rome, but often issues from a body claiming like authority.—R.]

5. *Diversity of calling.* Paul and Peter were engaged in the same one gospel, but to each the Lord had assigned a different mission; to the one, that to the Gentiles; to the latter, that to the Jews. Clearly conscious of this, they divided the field of labor between them. This diversity of calling, resting upon diversity of gifts (Charisms), or perhaps diversity in the providential course of previous life, *etc.*, must be carefully considered in the kingdom of God, if anything is to be really accomplished. One may stand fully and firmly upon the ground of evangelical faith, himself have living faith, and yet be by no means qualified for every task in the kingdom of God. In this respect also, the body of Christ has many members, having diverse offices, but coöperating for the same end. It is an organic whole, and hence such an organization as took place on a small scale among the Apostles is entirely admissible. It must, however, be natural, inwardly true, not artificial and merely external, else it were mechanical, not organic.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL

Ver. 1. From Starke:—A preacher must not shrink from toil and labor, when he finds opportunity in his ministry to further the gospel, but neglecting his own convenience, should be ready to offer up all the powers of his body and spirit in the service of God.—Rieger:—A carefully chosen company; Barnabas, a Jew, one of the first fruits unto Christ, and Titus a born Gentile, not even circumcised, but both one in Christ.—Starke:—It is an excellent thing when brethren are at one.—This is in the church of God a beginning of Synods, which are rightly retained.

Ver. 2. Let us strive at least for this, that what we do in weighty matters, we may do by God's governance and not after our own will. Conferences which are held concerning the affairs of the kingdom of God, by men who stand in one Spirit, have a great advantage, for thereby there comes to pass a communication of gifts between each other to the common use.—Hedinger:—To ask men for counsel, must have divine command, will and order, else it helps little in matters of faith, and it is hurtful for man to trust thereon.—Rieger:—Also as concerns repute with others, a man can receive nothing except it be given him from above. Paul with all that God had bestowed on him, and wrought through him, came into no such general repute. He had to endure continually increasing contradiction against himself. It must, however, have been for him a needful mantle of obscurity.—Starke:—As all hindrances, that can hinder the fruit of the Gospel must be diligently avoided, and removed out of the way, so also the undeserved suspicion of any.

Paul does not therefore defiantly say, "I know that I preach the right Gospel, let others think of it what they will," but he is concerned for a mutual understanding, for the convincing of others, in the interest of peace and of the cause which they serve in common.—[Calvin:—What then? Does the word of God fall, when it is unsupported by the testimony of men? No, but a powerful confirmation of faith is yielded, when all the teachers "speak the same thing and there are no divisions among them." Were many as desirous as he to edify the Church, they would take more pains to be agreed among themselves.—Wordsworth:—Paul did all that was requisite

on his part to *obviate* that very result which, unhappily, manifested itself among the Galatians, *viz.:* the bringing of his doctrine into *public* collision with that of the other Apostles. Also by the mention of the *private* conference, particularly with Peter, he prudently prepares the way for his description of the *public* dispute with Peter at Antioch.—R.]

Ver. 3. SPENER:—In things indifferent we may well, out of love, yield something of our liberty to the good of the weak. But where men would press these upon us as necessary to salvation, and our yielding would have the appearance of bringing the truth of the gospel into jeopardy, we should never yield.—STARKE:—It is wholly contrary to the nature of the gospel to lay on any one a constraint of conscience in things that concern our salvation, for the nature of the gospel is not to constrain, but to beseech, to allure, and to convince. But the spirit of Antichrist binds and constrains the consciences to his ordinances and doctrines of men.

Ver. 4. Even in the best state of the Christian church there are false brethren, who will be taken as right-minded Christians, and are not. Now these are much more dangerous than open enemies of the gospel. —CRAMER: — The true behavior of false teachers. They come not in at the right door; they are sneakers in, and hide themselves behind a false disguise.—HEDINGER:—Legal disciplinarians, who look at the outward cannot endure that others should enjoy liberty, and yet in the Spirit do more than they. Dear Christian! learn once for all, that outward taskwork cannot make a living heir of God. The heart! the heart! The heart, from its inmost centre must love, fear, honor God, flee sin, and praise Him, who for thee has died and is risen again.—STARKE:—The main aim of false teachers is only to take us prisoners to deprive us of our liberty in Christ, although they do not confess such an aim in words, but will have the appearance of wishing only to check carnal security and liberty.

Ver. 5. BERLENB. BIBLE:—The world and hypocrites count this for obstinacy. Is that then commendable? is the cry with it. I thought now that Christians should yield, and Paul boasts himself of just the opposite! But we must get the true understanding of the matter from the words that follows: We would not give way thereto in subjection, so as to suffer ourselves to be placed under this order of things. Otherwise a Christian willingly gives way, as Paul also proved when he circumcised Timothy. But when they would have him do it as a matter of conscience he did it not. One may be zealous for true freedom, and yet for love's sake bear with much. If it be not given out for a first step to salvation, love endures all; but faith will suffer no derogation of itself.—In our time many a one thinks on a sudden, that he will be as valorous as Paul, as Luther; but he must first have their spirit. For valor there needs a divine power.—Freedom and Truth must go together, else freedom profits not. Truth is inward, freedom, what one maintains outwardly thereof. They are treasures of two kinds, but springing from the same root. And because I will not suffer men to plant anything false in my heart, I must guard myself without.—From STARKE:—The law is something transient: it is the gospel that is permanent. The gospel too contains the kernel of all the Mosaic ceremonies, the shell only falls away. The shadow recedes when the sun rises.

The liberty which is in Christ: 1. We may renounce it for love's sake; 2. we must not let ourselves be robbed of it—for the truth of the gospel's sake.—The truth of the gospel is above all; may be hazarded at no price.—If the truth of the gospel is at stake, the combat may not be shunned.—[Our freedom, 1. negatively, from the bondage of the law, 2. positively, in Christ Jesus; hence Christian liberty no license.—False brethren the most dangerous enemies to liberty. Weak brethren disturb yet strengthen it; false brethren seek to undermine and destroy it. Because "out of Christ," yet in His camp, they spy out and would betray what we have in Him, our liberty.—What a contrast! the false brethren creeping in to rob others of truth and liberty; Paul our faithful, fearless, yet humble and holy champion for the truth which makes us free (Jno. viii. 32).—R.]

Ver. 6. WURT. SUMM.:—This is Paul's meaning: God looks not on the outward person and standing of a man, so that he should prefer a learned one to an unlearned, a rich man to a poor, a powerful man to a weak, but abides by the rule of His word, namely: "In every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of Him." In which thing we then should all follow God, and neither for the sake of a person or of any earthly thing, should we retire from the right or from the rule of God's word, but should abide steadfastly by it, even though an emperor, a king or a governor should command otherwise, or though it should cost life or limb.—STARKE:—In matters of faith, the authority of persons and outward prëeminence has no weight, but only the truth of doctrine, which is Christ's and from Christ.—[SCHAFF:—Paul means no disrespect to his colleagues, but even their advantages, he represents as having no weight where the truth of the gospel was concerned. His high sense of independence far from being identical with pride, rested in his humility; it was but the complement to the feeling of his absolute dependence upon God.

"God no respecter of persons." The Galatians were; why else this constant reference to those "of repute?" There is no slight intended to those of repute, but a rebuke to those who in their Christian opinion lean not on God, but on men, men of position, reputation. How many neither false brethren, nor so far gone in error as the bewitched Galatians pin their faith on the *δοκοῦντες*.—R.]

Ver. 7. STARKE:—The gospel is a Divine deposit and treasure, which is not given to any one for his own, but is only entrusted, so that we must deal with it as pleases Him who has given us such a trust.—SPENER:—God has made wise distribution among His servants; though He calls them in common to all spiritual functions, and none of them is quite free from some; yet He appoints to each in particular his certain part, where and in which he shall serve Him, and for that He fits him out with the needful

gifts. Therefore, special blessing attends their labor, when they are where the Lord has set them.

[The gospel treasure, the chosen vessels to which it was entrusted. The adaptation for the field of labor is the gift and trust of God's grace. The preparation of the field, God's providential work. The assignment of the field, God's act, to which the Church but consents, as in the first and weightiest case.—R.]

Ver. 8. SPENER:—All gifts, all power in instruction and success of labor, come from God, who must be effectual with us and in us, if we are to accomplish anything. 1 Cor. iii. 6; 2 Cor. iii. 6. Therefore, to Him belongs all the praise and thanks.—CRAMER:—The holy ministry is not a mere babbling, but a mighty instrument, wherewith God breaks hearts to pieces, as with a hammer, and also a two-edged sword, and a sharp knife, wherewith He cuts out the stony heart.

Ver. 9. STARKE:—We are bound, not only to recognize the grace which God has given to us, and rightly to use the same, but also to recognize that which others have received, and to be helpful that this also may be turned to use.

["James, and Cephas, and John." From WORDSWORTH:—He mentions these by name, because what he says was honorable to them. When he has anything less creditable to record, he spares the names of individuals even of the false brethren. He mentions Peter below, for which, doubtless, there was a necessity. It was providential, too, since some who claim to be the successors of St. Peter profess to be above error and beyond rebuke.—R.]

SPENER:—Although the teachers of the gospel, in respect of their office, are alike, yet there is a distinction between them in respect to gifts; and it is not amiss that, according to such distinction, they should be used for weightier and greater, or for lesser functions, and accordingly should be had in greater or less reputation. [CALVIN:—Even in the Church of God, he who enjoys a larger measure of grace ought, on that account, to receive higher honor. But, in all cases, let the rule be followed: "He that is greatest among you shall be your servant."—R.] —"They gave the right hands of fellowship." ANACKER, *Bibelstunden*:—What a moment must that have been! What a blessed working of the Holy Ghost! What a victory for the good cause of Paul, or rather for the cause of Christ's Gospel itself!

We here see the distinction between true and false union in matters of faith; it would have been false union, if Paul had yielded; that is, had abandoned the sound evangelical ground upon which he stood, and the three senior Apostles had then first recognized him; it was true union when Paul, with decision, maintained the evangelical truth, and the three yet joined fellowship with him, because they were persuaded of the truth, of the divine origin, of his preaching.—Accord in matters of faith: 1. Possible and permitted only where evangelical truth is maintained, and, therefore, Paul's firmness is not to be censured; 2. but this maintained, it is not only beautiful, but a duty; *a*) in the interest of the fulfilment of the commandment of love; *b*) in the interest of the advancement of the cause of God's kingdom.—The willingness of the Apostles to recognize Paul, an example for us; 1. they examined Paul's doctrine first; but 2. so soon as they had persuaded themselves of his Divine mission, they entered into fellowship with him, giving up their particular opinions and scruples.—The one apostolic church, built: 1. not upon the authority of one or another Apostle, but 2. upon the agreement of the same, or rather upon the One Gospel.—The gospel of righteousness through faith in Christ Jesus, the touchstone of true and false Apostles; the former unite in this, in spite of all other differences; the latter not, because they are concerned for themselves, and not for Christ.—ANACKER, *Bibelstunden*:—Did they not then immediately separate themselves again? O, no; they were and remained one in the Lord, but each knew the field into which especially the Lord had sent him, each joyfully accepted his part, and joyfully and humbly left to the other what belonged to him. So should it be among Christians!

Ver. 10. CRAMER:—It is a part of the holy ministry to have an eye to the poor and to the distribution of alms.—ANACKER, *Bibelstunden*:—With respect to the poor no division should occur; but in all the various spheres and callings which separate men, mainly in place and station, let compassionate love be a continual outward proof that we are one in the inner ground of faith. On the other hand, such fellowship of love in fruitful measure is only possible where there is a consciousness of the fellowship of faith.—F. MÜLLER:—Such love, we rejoice to believe, will again awake in our days; the hearts of Christians have become warm and intent on remembering the need of their brethren, whether it be in showing love to the distant heathen, or to those who, though in the midst of Christendom, yet live no better than heathen, or to oppressed brethren in the faith, who, surrounded by a hostile communion, lack the most necessary means for the maintenance of their church life. But such love is still far from prevailing fully among us.

[LUTHER:—True religion is ever in need. Wherefore a true and faithful pastor must have a care of the poor also.—BURKITT:—The faithful ministers of Christ ought, upon first and fit occasions, to excite and stir up their people to duties of charity, as well as piety; to costly and expensive duties, as well as those that are easy and less burdensome; these being no less profitable to the Church, and much more evidential of a real work of grace upon the heart.—WORDSWORTH:—Paul here shows 1. His fraternal coöperation with the other Apostles; 2. His love for the Jewish Christians; 3. That his non-compliance with the requirements of the false brethren was from no lack of charity to them. He became a suitor to the Gentiles for alms to the Jews, and at length a victim to the rancor of the Jews, when he was engaged at Jerusalem in the act of promoting this very thing.—R.]

[Unity in beneficence: 1. a fruit of the Spirit in the early Church; 2. a hopeful sign in the Church of the present day.—Paul forward in this work of beneficence; first in time, first in effort.—He continued to be forward. Just after writing

this Epistle, he made a tour, gathering the alms of the Greek churches for the saints at Jerusalem, whence came the impugners of his office and doctrine. Christian beneficence, like God's, overlooks unworthiness and ingratitude. "The false brethren" would be "forward" at the distribution of alms to the "saints," yet Paul's forwardness was not affected by this.—R.]

---

8. On one occasion (in Antioch) he therefore asserted, and, with the independence of an Apostle, dared assert, even in opposition to a Peter, the principles of his Gentile Christian preaching.

(Chap. ii. 11–21.)

11 But when Peter was come [Cephas[1] came] to Antioch, I withstood him to the face,
12 because he was to be blamed [was condemned][2]. For before that [omit that] certain
[certain *persons*] came from James, he did eat [was eating together][3] with the Gentiles: but when they were come [came][4] he withdrew and separated himself, fearing
13 them which were [omit which were][5] of the circumcision. And the other Jews[6] dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also [ὥστε καί, so that even
14 Barnabas] was carried away with [by] their dissimulation. But when I saw that
they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter [Cephas] before *them* [omit them] all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews,[7] why compellest thou [how[8] *is it that* thou art
15 compelling] the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? We *who are* [we *are*][9] Jews by
16 nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, Knowing [yet[10] knowing] that a man is
not justified by the works of the law, but [ἐὰν μή, except or but only] by the faith of Jesus Christ,[11] even we [we too] have [omit have][12] believed in Jesus Christ [Christ Jesus],[13] that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the
17 law: for[14] by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. But if, while we seek
to be justified by [in] Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, *is* therefore Christ
18 the minister of sin? God forbid [or Far from it]. For if I build again the things
19 [very things][15] which I destroyed, I make [prove][16] myself a transgressor. For I
20 through the law am dead [died] to the law, that I might live unto God. I am
[or have been] crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; [omit;] yet not I, [it is, however, no longer I that live][17] but Christ liveth in me: and [yea] the life which I now live in the flesh I live by [in] the faith of the Son of God,[18] who loved me,
21 and gave himself for me. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness
come by the law, then Christ is dead [died] in vain [without cause][19].

[1] Ver. 11.—Here also the preponderance of authority is in favor of Κηφᾶς. [As also in ver. 14. The simple past "came" is the best rendering of the aorist ἦλθεν.—R.]

[2] Ver. 11.—[Κατεγνωσμένος ἦν; "was condemned." The E. V., follows the Vulgate: *reprehensibilis*, which is incorrect. Some adopting a slightly different exegesis, render "had been condemned," but this is not so literal. See Exeg. Notes. Schmoller renders ἀνέστην: *entgegentrat*, "opposed," but "withstood" does not seem too strong.—R.]

[3] Ver. 12.—[The imperfect συνήσθιεν expresses the idea of "habitual eating in company with." So too the other verbs, ὑπέστελλεν and ἀφώριζεν; "he began to withdraw himself." *etc.*; but to express this fully would require a periphrasis in English. "Himself" is the object of both these verbs.—R.]

[4] Ver. 12.—Ἦλθεν instead of ἦλθον, probably an old mistake, from ver. 11, is found in ℵ. B. [The latter reading is adopted by modern editors on good MSS. authority.—R.]

[5] Ver. 12.—["Which were" should be italicised if retained.—R.]

[6] Ver. 13.—ℵ. adds πάντες. [No other authority; ℵ.[3] disapproves.—R.]

[7] Ver. 14.—"Καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς is wanting in Clar., Germ. [two very ancient Latin versions.—R.], Ambrosiaster, Sedulius, Agapetes: but the authorities are much too weak to permit us, with Semler and Schott, to take the words as a gloss." Meyer. [There is some doubt respecting the proper order; ℵ. A. B. C. F. G., Lachmann, Meyer, Ellicott, Alford (in later ed.), Lightfoot read: καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῇς, while D. E. K. L., most cursives, Rec., Tischendorf, Scholz, Wordsworth have ζῇς κ. οὐχ Ἰουδ. The former seems best sustained. The want of two adverbs equivalent to ἐθνικῶς and Ἰουδαϊκῶς makes it impossible to render literally in English, but the E. V. gives the correct sense.—R.]

[8] Ver. 14.—Πῶς, not τί, is the correct reading. So Lachmann, ℵ. [A. B. C. D. F., most cursives, Meyer and the majority of modern editors. Rec. (followed by E. V.) and Tischendorf have τί.—R.]

[9] Ver. 15.—[The insertion of "*who are*" in the E. V. has made this passage very obscure. "We" might be taken as the subject of "believed" (ver. 16), and all between as explanatory, but if "are" be supplied, the meaning is sufficiently clear. Ellicott adds "truly."—R.]

[10] Ver. 16.—"Δέ is wanting in Elz., but against the weight of authority. The omission was occasioned by taking εἰδότες as a definition of what precedes [*i. e.*, "sinners of the Gentiles"—R.], with which construction δέ would not agree. The omission was furthered by supposing a new sentence to begin with εἰδότες." Meyer. [Retaining δέ, the pointing of the E. V. is correct: "We are Jews," *etc.*, "yet (δέ slightly adversative) knowing," *etc.*—R.]

[11] Ver. 16.—[Tischendorf omits Χριστοῦ, but apparently on insufficient authority. The omission probably arose from an attempt to avoid the frequent repetition of Χριστός, which occurs three times in this verse. Some read Χρ. Ἰησοῦ.—R.]

[12] Ver. 16.—[Ἐπιστεύσαμεν, "believed," better than "have believed."—R.]

[13] Ver. 16.—[Here the order Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν is better supported.—R.]

[14] Ver. 16.—[Rec., C. E. K. L., Ellicott, Wordsworth read διότι, which was probably imported from Rom. iii. 20; ὅτι is supported by ℵ. A. B. F. G., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Lightfoot.—The order of Rec., οὐ δικ. ἐξ ἔργ. is not well sustained.—R.]

[15] Ver. 18.—[Literally: "if what things I destroyed, these I build again."—R.]

[16] Ver. 18.—[Συνιστάνω is adopted by modern editors on uncial authority; συνίστημι of Rec. is probably a grammatical gloss.—R.]

[17] Ver. 20.—[The pointing of the E. V. alters the meaning, and weakens the force of this passage, by making two clauses where there is really but one. As, however, δέ occurs three times in quick succession, and with a variation in its force, elegance demands this translation: "It is, however (δέ), no longer I that live, but (δέ) Christ liveth in me, yea, (*δέ resumptive*) the life," *etc.*—R.]

[18] Ver. 20.—Lachmann has τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ, following B. D. F. G. "It is highly probable that this reading originated in the transcriber's passing immediately over from the first to the second τοῦ, so that only τοῦ θεοῦ was written; as what followed was incongruous, καὶ Χριστοῦ was inserted. Meyer.

[19] Ver. 21.—[Δωρεάν may be more properly rendered: "Without cause." Tittmann, *sine justa causa*, not *frustra, sine effectu*. So Meyer, Ellicott, Lightfoot.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 11. **I withstood him to the face,** *etc.*—"To the face"=not behind his back, in his absence. [It does not mean "publicly," that is asserted below (ver. 4). Some of the fathers, "to salve the authority of Peter" introduced the gloss κατὰ σχῆμα, "in appearance," because he had been condemned by others. This view is opposed nobly by AUGUSTINE. See ALFORD and WORDSWORTH, *in loco*.—R.]

Because he was or had been condemned: the reason why Paul opposed him. It was not therefore any attack on the part of Peter himself, that occasioned Paul's taking a stand against him. Ἀνέστην, therefore not=I withstood him, but=I took a stand against him. [Yet Peter's conduct was an attack on gospel liberty; and Paul "opposed" sufficiently to "withstand" him.—R.]—The reason was, the indignant feeling of the Christians of Antioch, the unfavorable judgment passed upon him by them. Moreover, the scandal which he had given, was notorious, and Paul was obliged to do what he did. But he certainly did not do it out of personal irritation or from arrogance or malice; his own words prevent such a charge. For himself he did it unwillingly, would have avoided rebuking Peter "before them all." But a definite reason, viz., regard for the brethren, the Gentile Christian church, impelled him to it. And in this there was also a command, so that even regard for Peter on the other hand, was no ground for holding back. [It must be remarked that the Greek only states indefinitely that Peter "was condemned," by whom is a matter to be inferred. Various answers are given: by God, by his own previous conduct, by Paul himself (ALFORD), by the church at Antioch. The last is most probably meant, else the rebuke would not have been public. It is not necessary to suppose that only the scandal at Antioch drove Paul to this course, for the conduct of Peter was in itself *reprehensible*. "Had been condemned" must be preferred, if it be referred to a definite condemnation on the part of the Gentile Christians at Antioch.—R.]

Ver. 12. **For before certain persons came from James, he was eating together with the Gentiles**, *i. e.*, with the Gentile Christians. He designates them according to their nationality, because it is on this that the matter turns. Peter therefore neglected the limitations of the Levitical law of meats. This is the simple sense of this remark. "A Jew could not without Levitical defilement eat with Gentiles" (even if these adhered to the decrees of the apostolic council). "Peter, however, had through Divine revelation (Acts x.) been taught the untenableness of this isolation within the sphere of Christianity." This Jewish law of meats he disregarded, that is he lived ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς, at all events here in Antioch.—"Before certain persons came from James." "From James" is not to be connected with "certain persons" as if="certain adherents of James" (for "James would then be marked out as the head of a party, something which it would be neither necessary nor wise to do here"), but with "came," either generally="from James," that is, from his circle of helpers, or="sent by James." But at all events they were such as held like sentiments with James, *i. e.*, Jewish Christians, who themselves still adhered strictly to the Mosaic law, lived Ἰουδαϊκῶς καὶ οὐκ ἐθνικῶς, and who because, they felt obliged thereto as born Jews, regarded this Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆν as necessary for all born Jews, and accordingly for all Jewish Christians, but by no means demanded any such thing as the ἰουδαΐζειν of the Gentile Christians in Antioch, as WIESELER, perverting the state of facts maintains. They stood, therefore, upon the platform of James. "Certain persons" is not therefore= such as without ground, appealed to the authority of James; neither were they of the "false brethren" (ver. 4), who occupied a very different position from James. What views they had respecting the Gentile Christians, is not stated, for these were not at all in question; it is therefore natural to assume, that their views were those of James, and that the latter, when he sent these people, still thought as he did not long before, at the council (ver. 9; Acts xv.). [SCHAFF:—"It would seem from this passage that, soon after the council, James sent some esteemed brethren of his congregation to Antioch not for the purpose of imposing the yoke of ceremonialism upon Gentile Christians—for this would have been inconsistent with his speech—but for the purpose of reminding the Jewish Christians of their duty and recommending them to continue the observance of

the divinely appointed and time-honored customs of their fathers, which were by no means overthrown by the compromise measure adopted at the council. It is unnecessary therefore to charge him with inconsistency. All we can say is that he stopped half-way and never ventured so far as Paul, or even as Peter, who broke through the ceremonial restrictions of their native religion. Confining his labors to Jerusalem and the Jews, James regarded it as his mission to adhere as closely as possible to the old dispensation, in the hope of bringing over the nation as a whole to the Christian faith."*—R.] But with Peter, as a Jewish Christian and an Apostle to the Jewish Christians, they found fault, undoubtedly on account of his eating with the Gentiles, that is, with his neglect of the Mosaic law of meats, his ἐθνικῶς ζῆν. Yet it is by no means expressly said that they reproached him with it, for "fearing them of the circumcision," may merely mean, that he feared possible reproaches, such as those, Acts xi. 3. But as he then justified himself in this, and the justification was accepted (Acts xi. 18), there is the more reason to doubt whether the Jewish Christians, who came from James, really made reproaches against Peter, or even whether they would have done it, and whether it was not an empty fear on Peter's part, which was blamed the more on this account, as a causeless denying of the convictions which he then successfully vindicated, a retreat out of weakness, from the position he had then joyfully assumed and justified, supported as he was by the experience through which God had led him. Peter must of course have feared possible reproaches to this effect: that although his conduct at that time respecting Cornelius had afterwards been approved, it would be a different thing for him now, in the presence of Jewish Christians, to live ἐθνικῶς, and moreover that, in the absence of so definite an occasion as then, he would now be regarded as one also standing outside [*i. e.* with the Gentile Christians.—R.], his authority with the Jewish Christians might be diminished, *etc.* But even if such reproaches were really made to him, these persons nevertheless are not to be regarded as agreeing with the "false brethren" and standing upon an entirely different platform from James himself, for neither Acts xi. 18, nor Acts xv. is to be regarded as unhistorical. Out of fear, therefore, **he withdrew and separated himself.**—The imperfects are adumbrative, cause the events to go on, as it were, before the eyes of the reader.—MEYER.—He ate no more with the Gentile Christians, and as appears to be intimated, discontinued this without giving any explanation: he again attached himself to the Jewish Christians, that is, he behaved himself all at once as if the Jewish law of meats were still sacred in his view, inasmuch as he began again to observe it. He did not therefore give up his freer convictions, his practice alone lost its freedom, and stood therefore in contradiction with his convictions. In the act itself there was nothing different from that indulgent regard to the prejudices of those still weak, which Paul himself so often urges as a duty. But the *motive* of Peter's conduct in this case was not anxiety to avoid a possible scandal to the faith—this was not to be feared here—but the fear of men, fear of reproaches, and most likely also of losing consequence and authority. [It must be noted that such a withdrawal was a withdrawal from the very frequent *agapae* and the frequent Lord's Supper. Though the decree of the Apostolic council did not command or forbid the common participation of Jewish and Gentile Christians in these services, yet Peter had thus communed with the Gentile Christians; he ceased to do so, and of course made great scandal. While not violating the letter of the decree, he yet treated these brethren as unclean.—R.]

Ver. 13. Paul therefore fastens on the conduct of Peter (and of the other Jewish Christians who did likewise) the sharp censure of the term ὑπόκρισις, **dissimulation**, and he is the more severe, because along with the consideration for the Jewish Christians, begotten of fear, there was a non-consideration for the Gentile Christians: and thus they were both scandalized and perplexed, since by the change of conduct in Peter they were tempted to the thought that the Mosaic law must after all be binding. It is of course entirely incorrect to find the "dissimulation" in the former association with the Gentile Christians, as if this had been a momentary unfaithfulness towards actual Judaistic convictions.

[**Even Barnabas.**—"My co-laborer in the work of heathen missions and fellow-champion of the liberty of the Gentile brethren." SCHAFF.—LIGHTFOOT: "It is not impossible that this incident, by producing a temporary feeling of distrust, may have prepared the way for the dissension between Paul and Barnabas, which shortly afterwards led to their separation (Acts xv. 39). From this time forward they never again appear associated together. Yet whenever St. Paul mentions Barnabas, his words imply sympathy and respect. This feeling underlies the language of his complaint here, '*even* Barnabas.'" Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 6, and also the mention of Mark, Col. iv. 10.—R.]

[The conduct of Peter must be judged by the facts here stated, not by a desire to advocate or deny the primacy claimed for him. The occurrence is indeed characteristic of that Peter whom the Gospels describe; "first to confess Christ, first to deny Him; first to recognize and defend the rights of the Gentiles, first to disown them practically. His strength and weakness, boldness and timidity are the two opposite manifestations of the same warm, impulsive and impressible temper" (SCHAFF). The fault was one of practice, not of doctrine. The receiving of the rebuke is a sign of Peter's genuine piety. Whether he went out again and wept bitterly we know not. But there was no "sharp contention," and Peter's love for Paul remained. On the early discussions respecting this occurrence see LIGHTFOOT, p. 127, sq., showing how much the church is indebted to AUGUSTINE for a correct view of it. Comp. DOCTRINAL NOTES.—R.]

*[When we consider this position of James, and look at the Epistle which bears his name, we are led, not to doubt its inspiration and place in the canon, but rather to believe that it must be inspired, else it would have differed more from the writings of Paul, and that its place in the canon is a proof of the wisdom of God, who made His Word complete, by making it many-sided, and yet never contradictory.—R.]

Ver. 14. **But when I saw that they walked not uprightly,** *etc.*—We are to supply from ver. 11: "And at the same time heard the Gentile Christians expressing themselves in condemnation of it." [The necessity of supplying this makes it the more doubtful, whether the reference there is to the "condemnation" on the part of the Gentile Christians.—R.] *Πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* hardly = "according to," which would be *κατά*, but "in the direction of," = in order to preserve uprightly and further the truth of the gospel.

The sense, therefore, is the same as in ver. 5. This agrees with the context, for Paul, in the conduct of Peter and the other Jewish Christians, beheld an infringement of the "truth of the gospel," especially of the principle of Christian freedom founded in the gospel, on account of its effect on the Gentile Christians: "How is it that thou art compelling the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" (MEYER).—[The force of *πρός* is open to discussion, especially as the word *ὀρθοποδεῖν* is not only *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, but very rare. LIGHTFOOT says it denotes here "not the goal to be attained, but the line of direction to be observed. See WINER, p. 424." And ELLICOTT in reply to MEYER, who claims that *κατά* would have been used to express the idea of rule or measure, observes that the instances he quotes are all after *περιπατεῖν*. If the line of direction be the meaning, the E. V. is correct, and the implication is that Peter did not deviate from the "truth of the gospel," but from the line of conduct which the truth of the gospel marked out, hence the verb retains a semi-local meaning, "walk straight."—R.]

Before all, "very probably = in an assembly of the Church, although not convened immediately for this purpose" (MEYER)—before Jewish and Gentile Christians.—**If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles:** means the accustomed practice of Peter, from which he only then receded.—**How is it that thou art compelling the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?**—Paul shows him the self-contradictoriness of his behavior, by a kind of ironical address. "Thou thyself a Jew, livest as a Gentile—and how comes it, then, that thou constrainest Gentiles to live Jewishly? Is not that an utter contradiction?" It is true Peter does not *constrain* the Gentiles directly; it is a turn which sharpens the censure; in reality, it was only an indirect constraining through the authority of the example of Peter. The opinion is, therefore, quite unfounded, which supposes that the messengers of James had preached the principle of the *necessity* of the observance of the law—even for Gentile Christians—and that Peter had at least tacitly supported this principle. Thereby they would have directly oppugned the view of James himself (Acts xv.), and Peter would have oppugned his own. His "dissimulation" at this time by no means authorizes the assumption that he had changed his view as to the indispensableness or dispensableness of the law itself.—But at all events the Gentile Christians in Antioch looked upon Peter as one who, previously not observing the Jewish law, all at once began to observe it. That it was mere "dissimulation," and not an actual change of view respecting the law, they did not at first know; and, therefore, they might easily, even if no one attempted directly to impose the law upon them, feel constrained to regard it as something necessary, and also to guide themselves in practice according to it—at least, in this one point respecting meats. There was at all events the danger that such a *moral compulsion* might be exercised; and when once a single point was regarded as necessary, matters might go farther. —Against WIESELER'S explanation: "You so act that the Gentiles also must live as Jews, if they wish any longer to eat with you" (which is connected with his erroneous view respecting the journey of the Apostle narrated ii. 1 sq.), let it be here remarked only: Had Peter, by his conduct, only imposed on the Gentile Christians of Antioch the necessity of again observing the decrees of the apostolic council, in order to be able to eat with the Jewish Christians, and had Paul himself so regarded it, Peter would certainly not have received this public rebuke from Paul. Peter's conduct, his yielding from fear, would indeed have been censurable, yet the consequences of this for others could only have given occasion for a public rebuke, provided they endangered the *life of faith*; but on Wieseler's supposition this could not have resulted.—*Ἰουδαΐζειν* is, without doubt, different from *Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆν*, and is not merely another expression for this, but it is with design that *Ἰουδ. ζῆν* is not repeated. With Peter, at that time, a relapse into *Ἰουδ. ζῆν* took place—at least in practice, and through it a misleading of the Gentile Christians into *ἰουδαΐζειν* was to be feared. *Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆν* was in the Jewish Christian something in itself quite irreprehensible, was only a maintenance of national usage; in the Gentile Christian a *Ἰουδ. ζῆν* became a *ἰουδαΐζειν*, that is, a Judaizing, being a Judaizer. [Hence, when Peter, who had been living *ἐθνικῶς*, occupying the position of the Gentile Christians, began again to live *Ἰουδαϊκῶς* his action was constructively *ἰουδαΐζειν*, and a moral compulsion put upon his late associates, the Gentile Christians, to do the same.—R.] The distinction is difficult to render in a translation; it is something like, "to live Jewishly,"—"to be Jewish."

Vers. 15–21. That this is a continuation of the address to Peter, is self-evident to every unprejudiced reader, and the assumption that an address to the Galatians suddenly comes in here is so utterly at variance with the context that it is unnecessary to refute it. To mention no other reasons against it, let any one read the historical narrative, extending from as far back as chap. i. 13, up to this point, and imagine now, all at once, without any transition, an address to the Galatians, beginning, "We are, by nature, '*Jews*.'" This view, it is true, has found again decided advocates in WIESELER, VON HOFMANN. True, on our view also, the exposition is somewhat difficult, but it commends itself too distinctly to allow us to hesitate on account of the difficulties of the interpretation. And has not this difficulty, in part, its ground in this, that Paul only cites words, spoken on *another* occasion, and perhaps somewhat condensed also.—At all events the words are not to

be regarded as merely addressed to Peter personally. Paul passes over into a more general exposition, for the instruction of the Gentile and Jewish Christians that were then present. "He makes out of the transaction, which then arose respecting the eating or not eating with the Gentiles, a *locum communem* (an article of doctrine), which extends much further than the transaction itself. He speaks of the works of the law generally."—Roos. Paul cites with such detail his words then uttered for this very reason, that the substance of what he then said corresponds so well with the purpose of his letter, suits the case of the Galatians so precisely. Of course it cannot be affirmed that Paul cites the words that he then used, with literal exactness; his expressions may have been modified to a nearer correspondence with the particular purpose for which he here adduces them, although there is nowhere in the expressions themselves any necessity for such an opinion.

Ver. 15. **We are by nature Jews**, *etc.*—Vers. 15–17 give the ground of the censure in ver. 14: We, as Jews, have the law, which, of itself, exalts us above the Gentiles, who, as "without law," are to be regarded as "sinners;" yet we have surrendered the preëminence which we had, and emancipated ourselves from the law in the knowledge that a man is not justified by it, but by faith in Christ,—how then can one of us wish to bring the Gentiles under the law, over whom it was never in force?—would be the very obvious conclusion, which Paul, at all events, compels the hearer to draw, but he himself makes the more general, but more pointed one: How then can any one of us press the observance of the law again, as though otherwise we fell into the category of Gentiles of sinners? One who does this makes Christ thereby a minister of sin—that is, he declares, by this reëstablishment of the law, that faith in Christ itself, as it involves the giving up of the law, brings men into the category of sinners (ver. 17).—**Not sinners of the Gentiles.**—Spoken from the national and theocratic point of view, on which Paul expressly places himself by the emphasizing of their Jewish descent. From that point of view, the Gentiles, as *ἄνομοι*, in contrast with the Jews, who are *ἔννομοι*, are, in themselves, *ἁμαρτωλοί κατ' ἐξοχήν*, although it is, of course, certain that Paul, in another sense, enforces the truth that there is also an *ἐν νόμῳ ἁμαρτ.*, Rom. ii. 12; and that, in a deeper sense, they also, as Jews (with the law), were *ἁμαρτωλοί*, is an essential thought of the following context, inasmuch as they found justification only through faith in Christ.

Ver. 16. **Yet knowing that.**—It is simplest to take *εἰδότες δέ*, "knowing that," *etc.*, as the protasis, so that the apodosis begins with *καὶ ἡμεῖς*, "we also," and to supply *ἐσμέν* in ver. 15. The objection of Meyer, that the statement of how Paul and Peter had come to the faith, would not be historically accurate, inasmuch as the conversion of neither had come to pass in the discursive way implied in *εἰδότες . . . ἐπιστ.*, is whimsical. The foundation of their faith in Christ was the knowledge, or at least the feeling, that in this faith alone "justification" was found. Only in the measure in which they acquired this conviction, did their faith in Christ become a full, ripe faith.—**A man is not justified**, *etc.*—As Paul here is merely citing words spoken on another occasion, the doctrine of the justification of man not by works of the law, but by faith in Jesus Christ appears here only as a doctrinal principle of the general Pauline theology. It is uttered in a very definite manner, is almost dogmatically formulated, yet strictly speaking it is not demonstrated, but presupposed as familiar. (Chap. iii. contains not so much an elucidation of the nature of justification as a demonstration that it results from "faith," not from "the law," instructive as this demonstration doubtless is for the apprehension of its nature.) Hence the philological investigation of the word *δικαιοῦν* belongs rather to the exposition of the Epistle to the Romans. On the doctrinal conception of justification, see Doctrinal Notes below.

Looking at the present context alone, we should be disposed to refer the expression, **works of the law** to merely ceremonial requirements of the law; but by thus doing we should miss entirely the Apostle's meaning. The meaning of the phrase "not justified by the works of the law" is not to be gathered from the immediate context merely; it is, as intimated above, a proposition, elsewhere set forth in detail, and only cited here with the presupposition that it is familiar.—The idea *ἔργα νόμου* is to be taken in the universality implied in the expression. It denotes simply works prescribed by the law, whether of a more ritual character, or, in the stricter sense, moral injunctions. For a more particular consideration, see Doctrinal Notes below.

[The E. V. renders *ἐὰν μή* rather weakly, "but," since the meaning is "except," "but only," *sola fide* (Luther, Meyer). The justification is not at all by works of the law; which is also the meaning of the formal, final clause of the verse.—*Διὰ πίστεως*, *per fidem*. Faith is the means by which justification is received. Hooker: "The only hand which putteth on Christ to justification." The Apostle also uses *ἐκ* with *πίστεως*; that preposition may imply *origin*, but as it is used with *πίστεως* in this connection, that idea is forbidden; perhaps the reason of the change was merely to make the correspondence, *ἐξ ἔργων—ἐκ πίστεως*. It is here used in each case with *ἔργων*, where the thought of origin may be implied.—**We believed in Christ Jesus.**—Not "became believers in" (Lightfoot), but "have put our faith in." The preposition (*εἰς*) retaining its proper force, and marking not the mere direction of the belief, but the ideas of union and incorporation with (Ellicott).—There seems to be some ground for the change from "Jesus Christ" to "Christ Jesus" here; it is more elevated than the usual form (Meyer), brings the Messiahship into prominence, as "we also" refers to Paul and Peter, who were Jews (Alford). Still this must not be insisted on.—The genitives *Χριστοῦ* and *νόμου* throughout are objective genitives (Meyer, Ellicott, Alford).—R.]

For by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.—[Schaff: "Literally, 'shall all flesh not be justified,' 'find no justifica-

tion.' For the negation attaches to the verb, and not to the noun." This justifies the force of *ἐὰν μή* above. No justification at all from works, even in connection with faith.—R.] This is founded on Ps. cxliii. In the parallel passage, Rom. iii. 20, *ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*, "in his sight," is further added. WIESELER: "The words *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου* Paul has added entirely in the sense of the original passage; for when the Psalmist said, that before God no flesh shall be justified, he of course had in mind the works prescribed by the O. T. law. Since then this law prescribes not only outward works, but also holy dispositions, we must understand the latter also as included both by the Psalmist and Paul among the works of the law."—"Shall be justified."—"It remains undetermined whether the Apostle writes *δικαιωθήσεται* [future] in view of a final issue in the case of the individual or of mankind, but a final judgment is indicated by the future both here and in the original passage. Only thus, too, is there a progress of thought; otherwise the discourse would be intolerably indefinite. The entrance upon the way of faith (*ἐπιστεύσαμεν*) is explained from the knowledge that in the present it is the only means of becoming righteous, and the exclusion of the way of legal doing (*καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων*) has its ground in the unprofitableness of it, for appearing before God hereafter as righteous." VON HOFMANN.

Ver. 17. **But if, while we seek to be justified in Christ.**—"In Christ" not=through communion with Christ, as *ἐν Χρ. εἶναι*, although of course faith brings us into inward union with Christ, but it "denotes Christ as the ground of our justification, as the *causa meritoria* in which it rests" (WIESELER). [The phrase *ἐν Χριστῷ* is a formula of such deep significance in Paul's Epistles, that it is perhaps better always to find in it the idea of union, fellowship with Christ. Why not understand it thus: justified because in Christ by faith? See ELLICOTT, and compare MEYER *in loco*.—R.]

We ourselves also.—On our side also, so that we too came into the class of "sinners of the Gentiles." If we came into this class in and through the effort to be justified in Christ, Christ would thus be a **minister of sin**, would make sinners and not "righteous," and would therefore render a service to sin. On this interpretation of the protasis, the apodosis cannot be an interrogation (against MEYER); for from this apodosis it is now justly concluded that Christ would be the minister of sin.—**God forbid** negatives therefore the protasis on account of the consequence resulting therefrom—a consequence in fact utterly inadmissible. It is true, everywhere else in Paul's writings, *μὴ γένοιτο* negatives a question. If it be thought on this account necessary to assume a question here, the protasis must be taken differently, somewhat thus: "But if we, while we were seeking to be justified in Christ, were ourselves found sinners—because we would thereby declare, that the law has not availed us for justification, but that we were notwithstanding the law sinners, still needing justification—is Christ therefore a minister of sin?" Only we should then expect, as in Rom. iii. 3, 5, *μὴ Χριστὸς ἁμ. διάκονος;* as VON HOFMANN remarks. He therefore supplies *εὑρέθημεν* in the protasis, making it a complete sentence, and translates: "But if as those, who seek to be justified in Christ, *&c.*, we are found, then are we also found sinners." But this explanation is evidently forced. It must also be noted that, while Paul elsewhere only uses *μὴ γένοιτο* after an interrogation, he as constantly introduces that interrogation with *οὖν*. As a deviation from his usual practice must be admitted in any case, the further deviation, that *μὴ γέν.* is not preceded by an interrogation may well be conceded. But in any case the explanation is difficult. [LIGHTFOOT fairly discusses the various explanations. 1. As an attack on the premises through a monstrous conclusion (as above). 2. An illogical conclusion deduced from premises in themselves correct. This view, which makes an interrogation in the last clause, is preferred by him, and by most English commentators. "'Seeing that in order to be justified in Christ it was necessary to abandon our old ground of legal righteousness and to become sinners (*i. e.*, to put ourselves in the position of the heathen) may it not be argued that Christ is thus made a minister of sin?' This interpretation best develops the subtle irony of *ἁμαρτωλοί*: 'We Jews look down upon the Gentiles as sinners; yet we have no help for it but to become sinners like them.' It agrees with the indicative *εὑρέθημεν* and with Paul's use of *μὴ γένοιτο*." It paves the way for the words which follow: "I, through the law, am dead to the law." Ἆρα is to be preferred to ἄρα in this case.. The former hesitates, the latter concludes.—R.]

Μὴ γένοιτο,* in no way whatever is Christ a "minister of sin," for it is not the seeking justification in Him, that makes me a sinner, but I am found a sinner in an entirely opposite case. [LIGHTFOOT: "Nay verily, *for*, so far from Christ being a minister of sin, there is no sin at all in abandoning the law; it is only converted into a sin by returning to the law again."—R.]

Ver. 18. **For if I build again the very things I destroyed.**—In this opposite case, I represent myself as a sinner, but the blame does not rest on Christ. "Build up again," *etc.* Thus Paul describes the conduct of Peter, "who previously, and even in Antioch had at first declared the Mosaic law not binding, as Christians had therefore, as it were, torn it down as a now useless building; but afterwards through his Judaizing conduct (even though it did not arise from conviction), represented it again as binding, and hence, as it were, built up the demolished edifice anew."—"The first person veils what had taken place *in concreto*, under the

*[WORDSWORTH: "On this formula, derived from the LXX. it is to be observed that the Septuagint render—(1) אָמֵן (Amen) by *γένοιτο*. See the remarkable instance in Deut. xxvii. 15–18, *etc.*; and (2) they render חָלִילָה, *i. e., absit*, literally *profanum sit*, by *μὴ γένοιτο* (Gen. xliv. 7. 17; Josh. xxii. 29). Μὴ γένοιτο is something much more than a direct negation, such as '*No verily.*' It is a vehement expression of indignant aversion, reprobating and abominating such a notion as that by which it is looked. And therefore the English, *God forbid!* properly understood, *i. e.*, God forbid that any one should so *speak*, is a fit rendering of it. It is used fourteen times by St. Paul (ten times in the Epistle to the Romans, thrice to the Galatians, and once in 1 Corinthians), and is generally employed by him to rebut an objection supposed by him to be made by an opponent, as here."—R.]

milder form of a general statement" (MEYER).—WIESELER, according to his view of the whole section, gives the sense thus: "But if we also, who seek to be justified in Christ, are convicted as sinners, that is, should sin; Christ is not therefore a promoter of sin. For then I am myself to blame for the transgression, since what I have destroyed (namely, the dominion of sin!) this I build up again." According to this, Paul is here laying stress upon the indissoluble connection between justification and sanctification. Certainly a striking example of dogmatizing exegesis.—**I prove myself a transgressor**:—*i. e.*, of the law. In what way? we must ask, for it might be the "destroying" itself in which the sin consisted, not the "building again." The latter certainly; in ver. 19 Paul tells us why.

Vers. 19-21. [BENGEL: "*Summa ac medulla Christianismi.*"—R.]

Ver. 19. **For I through the law died to the law.**—"'I' for my own part, letting my own experience speak, to say nothing of the experience of others." MEYER. "For" introduces a proof, found in "through the law." "Whoever has been freed from the law through the law itself, in order to stand in a higher relation, acts in opposition to the law, proves himself a transgressor if notwithstanding this he returns again into the legal relation." MEYER. Νόμος is of course in both cases the Mosaic law, since otherwise the passage would have no demonstrative force; not the law of Christ in the first case as Rom. viii. 2. [The distinction made by LIGHTFOOT in his notes on this passage, must be regarded. The law is here spoken of, not as to its *economical purpose* (as WORDSWORTH who limits the meaning here to the law as a covenant), but rather in its *moral effects.*—R.] "I through the law died to the law" that is, the law itself caused me to die to it. But what now is the meaning of 1. "*I died to the law*"? That thereby a becoming free from the law is affirmed is clear. But in the first place this "dying to the law" is not (with many expositors) to be construed as an activity bearing upon the law=it has come to this, that I have acquitted myself of dependence on the law, *etc.* The Apostle means to affirm something as having happened *to* him, not something as having been done *by* him, although of course this event has had a basis in his ethical nature. In the next place, however, the conception of dying, which is involved in the expression, is not to be at once transmuted into that of becoming free; or else justice is not done to the Apostle's turn of thought, which here, as the sequel shows, revolves about the ideas of life and death. Compare the analogous expressions: ἀποθανεῖν ἁμαρτίᾳ, νεκρ. ἁμαρτίᾳ, Rom. vi. 2, 10, 11, where also the Apostle, as the connection in each passage shows, means an event coming to pass through dying, ver. 10 in the physical, vers. 2, 11, in the ethical sense. Still more closely analogous is Rom. vii. 1 sq. In ver. 4 of that passage we have the analogous expression—only there it is passive, while here it is expressed by the neuter verb θανατωθῆναι τῷ νόμῳ and in ver. 1 he gives us the key to the figure in the sentence; "the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth." The becoming free from the law is therefore, of course, the *result* of the dying to the law, but not immediately this itself. "Died to the law" is=I have died with this effect, that the law has lost me, who had hitherto belonged to it, that is, that its dominion over me, its claims upon me ceased, so that it could no longer urge its requirements upon me, as heretofore. While "died" of itself already intimates the legitimacy of this acquittal from the law, the complete demonstration of this is contained in the fact that this dying "to the law" has come to pass "*through* the law" not by a power residing outside of it has this death to the law been effected, not in any antinomistic way, not in conflict with the law, so that this would have any ground of complaint. But now the question is 2. how has he "*through the law*" died to the law? how has the "law" itself brought about in him a state of death as regards the law, and therewith a release from its dominion? Thus much, that the law leads to death, Paul plainly declares, *e. g.* Rom. vii. 5, 10, 11, 13. The middle term there is, that it is the νόμος itself which excites sin into ἀναζῆν. This thought is of obvious application here, The explanation would then be; by the fact that the "law" brought me death, its dominion over me reached, it is true, its culmination, but thereby also was broken and done away. For with him who has died, the dominion of the law ceases—according to the principle cited above. And deducing the reason from the passage itself, we might thus state it; for the law can no more come forward with the claims that I should keep it, in order to justification, when its effect is rather death. The objection that the Apostle could not well affirm this "dying" of himself, as something actual since by his conversion he had been preserved from this effect of the law, will not hold; for Paul, Rom. vii. 10 affirms this very thing himself. This explanation is, however, at variance with the fact that according to iii. 24, the νόμος is, indeed παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν, but of itself, without Christ, does not yet lead to man's becoming free from it. Now it is true, that this passage reads as if Paul here refers the dying to the law directly to the law itself, but he then proceeds to give the elucidation of this, by giving the immediate cause of the dying, namely, "I have been crucified with Christ." This statement therefore explains the former one. In the same way the dying unto sin, mentioned Rom. vi. is by means of the "dying with Christ," and in Rom. vii. the death of Christ is made the cause of the becoming dead to the law. Thus much then is already clear, that the "law" in both cases is of course the same (Mosaic) law, but in each case it comes into view in a different relation; in νόμῳ in its requirements, in διὰ νόμου in its effect. This explains in a simple way the paradoxical expression, according to which the law appears as making free from itself. But since it is still the same law, Paul is entitled to say, that he who will nevertheless again live unto the law although "through the law he died unto the law" exhibits himself as a "transgressor" *&c.*, of the law.

Let us now consider the first statement of the purpose of this dying namely: **that I might live unto God**, with the dying to the law the

living to the law, has, as the very terms imply, come to an end. As long as this existed, no living unto God was possible, but with the dying to the law every hinderance to this living unto God is removed. "Live unto God:" just as Rom. viii. 11. As the dying to the law may not be treated as immediately convertible into a being released from the law, obliterating the conception of dying; so on the other hand the realism of the Pauline expressions requires the like in the case of the antithetical expression: "live to God." Paul wishes first to oppose to the being dead a being alive, therefore this means: that I might be living as regards God=with this effect, that God should have me, after the law has lost me. As from the being dead there resulted the dissolution of a connection—with the law—which had hitherto existed, so from the life there results the formation of a new connection, namely, with God. (Why precisely this results, appears first from what follows, for from the dying "to the law through the law" of itself, there would certainly not as yet result any new life at all, and especially a life for God.) Hence by "living unto God" as well as by "dying to the law" Paul wishes to express, chiefly, an event, not an activity, something which should be accomplished in him, not something which should be done by him in consequence of the dying to the law. Comp. the way in which Paul, Rom. vi. 11 sets forth the "living unto God" of Christians as something that actually comes to pass in their case, not as something which is as yet their task. According to this it would be about=*εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρῳ*, Rom. vii. 4; to belong to God. which involves both a being under God's authority and a communion with God. So far it rather affirms the possession of a good, the attainment of a position, the gaining of a profit, than the proposal of a work. The next verse especially leads us to refer it to the full filial status in relation to God, as it appertains primarily to Christ. This filial status would then be opposed to the condition under the law. Comp. iii. 23 sq. The fact that Paul here contrasts "God" and "law," "living unto God" and "living to the law" would then be explained by the essential difference existing between the full filial position of God's children and the state of bondage under the law. And the antithesis would be essentially the same which Paul sets forth, Rom. vi. 14, as an antithesis between being "under the law" and "under grace." Life, however, is not merely a state, but essentially an activity also, actualizing itself and having permanence only as such. Hence "living to God" indicates, though not primarily, yet as immediately resulting, an activity and course of conduct with reference to God, and the more so indeed for the very reason, that by this "living to God" especially a good is gained; on which account also Paul, *e. g.*, Rom. vi. 12, 13, affirms as an obligation contained therein, the obligation "to yield one's self to God." Since he there derives this obligation from the "being alive unto God," we should doubtless assume it here also, as a secondary idea implied in "that I might live unto God." In the first place the expression *ἵνα*—statement of design—points to something, which even if it is on the one hand already given, yet on the other is also still to be looked for. And in the second place the connection points to this ethical interpretation, for Paul means to repel the allegation that by faith in Christ, by abandoning the position of the law, one becomes a sinner: and he cannot do this more emphatically than by describing the release from the law as the operation of the law itself, and as having for its purpose the living unto God. "Living unto God" then passes over into the meaning: to dedicate one's life to God, the dative thus acquiring of course a yet fuller meaning, denoting not merely possession, but devotion, surrender to. The antithesis between "living unto God" and "living unto the law" is also to be explained as Rom. vii. For the law leads "to sin" (and to death). The living to the law then in truth sunders from God. The "dying to the law" thus acquires the sense of dying unto sin (Rom. vi.), though of course it is not to be identified with it.

[Ellicott thus sums up the results; while his views do not differ materially from those given above, the statement is so succinct that the substance of it may well be inserted here: 1. Law in each case has the same meaning. 2. The Mosaic law is meant. 3. The law is regarded under the same aspect as in Rom. viii. 7, 13, a passage in strictest analogy with the present. 4. It was not *διὰ νόμου* or *κατὰ νόμον* but *διὰ νόμου*, through the instrumentality of the law, that the sinful principle worked within and brought death upon all. 5. "Died" is not merely "*legi valedixi*," but expresses generally what is afterwards more specifically expressed by "I have been crucified with." 6. The dative "to the law" is not merely "with reference to," but a species of dative "*commodi*:" "I died not only as concerns the law, but as the law required." He paraphrases thus "I *through the law*, owing to sin, was brought under its curse; but having undergone this, with, and in the person of Christ, I *died to the law* in the fullest and deepest sense—being both free from its claims and having satisfied its curse." So Lightfoot: "The law is the strength of sin. At the same time it provides no remedy for the sinner. On the contrary it condemns him hopelessly, for no one can fulfil the requirements of the law. The law then exercises a double power over those subject to it; it makes them sinners and punishes them for being so. What can they do to escape? They have no choice but to throw off the bondage of the law, for the law itself has driven them to this. They find the deliverance, which they seek, in Christ. Thus then they pass through three stages 1. Prior to the law—sinful, but ignorant of sin; 2. under the law—sinful, and conscious of sin, yearning after better things; 3. free from the law—free and justified in Christ. The second stage ('through the law') is a necessary preparation for the third ('died to the law')." So Meyer and many others, following Chrysostom in the main.—R.]

Ver. 20. **I have been crucified with Christ.**—*Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι.* "I have come into fellowship with Christ's death on the cross, through faith, so that what happened to Christ has also happened to me." The Apostle declares thereby in what way the dying to the law

through the law has been effected. Christ died "through the law," for in the crucifixion the curse of the law was fulfilled upon Him. Whoever therefore is "crucified with Christ," has also died "through the law"=the curse of the law is fulfilled on him too. But Christ, dying *through* the law, died also *to* the law, *i. e.*, His life of subjection to the law came to an end (comp. iv. 4) even according to the principle, Rom. vii. 1, and the more so in His case, because it brought the curse undeservedly upon Him, and therefore forfeited its claim. As now the one "crucified with Christ" has died "*through* the law," he has at the same time thereby also died "to the law"=he has, for the law, become a dead man, such an one as is no longer subject to the law, is free from it and its claims. The law over against him has no right of possession, having lost it. Comp. Rom. vii. 2: "dead to the law through the body of Christ." An equivalent sense is contained in chap. iii. 25: "faith having come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." For "crucified with Christ" rests essentially upon "faith." As "I have been crucified with Christ" was the proof of the precious declaration (ver. 19), so ver. 20 first makes clear, why in consequence of the "dying to the law through the law," he has attained to a "living unto God." For as it is especially true of Christ that through the law, He died to the law, so it is also especially true of Him, that this came to pass that He might live unto God. Comp. Rom. vi. 10. For His death on the cross was for Him the departure from that life in which He also had been subject to the law (iv. 4), and through His resurrection it led in His case to the entrance into a life of another kind, into a life, in which He without any medium stood in immediate relation to God, in a pure filial relation, something which is most simply expressed by "living unto God." Whoever now believes in Christ, participates, as in Christ's death, so in Christ's new life; as he is crucified with Christ, so he lives with Christ (Rom. vi. 8). But Paul does not stop with this thought; he is not satisfied with a "crucified Christ" that he might live with Christ.—**It is, however, no longer I that live.**—In his case the being "crucified with" has indeed led to a life; but what now lives in him is no more his Ego; this his Ego did live, when he was still under the law, without knowledge of Christ; it is therefore an Ego essentially linked with the law, disappearing with the legal life, so that he after the revolution which has come to pass within him through faith in Christ and the release from the law, must regard it as altogether vanished out of existence. This whole Ego has died with Christ.—**But Christ liveth in me.**—Another life is it, on the contrary (δέ adversative), that is now in him, the life of another personality; and this personality is Christ, *viz.*, as one who has Himself passed through death to life. And as such He is living unto God. Therefore although living with Christ has as its result, living unto God, this must needs become far more complete by a living of Christ Himself in the man.

Yea the life which now I live in the flesh.—But while Paul has declared of himself, that Christ Himself lives in him, Christ as the risen and glorified One, he, on the other hand, knows well that even yet there appertains to him as before, a life "in the flesh," *i. e.* a life of terrestrial corporeality, and so far, therefore, a yet imperfect life, which of itself stands in conflict with the life of Christ in him (δέ in ὁ δέ adversative). [It is perhaps better to regard δέ as introducing an explanatory and partially concessive clause (ELLICOTT). "So far as I now live in the flesh; it is still a life in faith." LIGHTFOOT. To avoid the repetition of "but"—the word "yea" will convey the force of the connection—"Even though I do live a life in the flesh, Christ so lives in me, that yea this very life I live by the faith," *etc.*—R.] "Flesh" here does not of course affirm an ethical defect, for he affirms this life at this very moment of himself, but only so to speak, a physical life; the opposite idea is not: in the Spirit, but: in vision, in heaven. Paul does not, however, on this account, recall what he said before, but reconciles the life "in the flesh" with the life of Christ in him by **I live in the faith.**—"Now" is in opposition to the past time before the "dying to the law." Now, after he has died to the law, he lives, it is true, even yet "in the flesh," but he lives "in the faith." "In the faith" is of course opposed, first of all in a restricted way, to "in the flesh," on which account also the two phrases are conjoined; but in fact it constitutes the antithesis to the previous "living to the law." [Not "by faith," but "in faith," "the atmosphere as it were which he breathed in this his new spiritual life" (LIGHTFOOT).—R.] **Of the Son of God,**—Christ, we may believe, is designedly distinguished by this exalted predicate, in order to characterize faith as something great, in that it lays hold on the Son of God Himself. As if to say: what matters it that I still live in the flesh? Even in the flesh I possess through faith the Son of God! At the same time also the preposterousness of the thought, that one can become a sinner, "seeking to be justified in Christ," [or that "Christ is a minister of sin."—R.] is intimated. **Who loved me and gave himself for me.**—"It is indeed natural that I should believe on Him, since He," *etc.* — and on the other hand this is a more definite statement of what faith believes.

Ver. 21 is a simple conclusion from what immediately precedes. Men cannot now say, that **I frustrate the grace of God**, for this manifested itself in the atoning death of the Son of God. But precisely in this do I believe, yea, my whole life is a life in faith thereon. Exactly the reverse: **if righteousness come through the law, then Christ died without cause,** needlessly, and if I through the law sought justification, I should then declare the death of Christ to have taken place in vain, and should thus reject the grace of God: but now this latter is precisely what I did not do, and therefore not the former; I cannot be reproached with this. It is to be supposed, that some accused Paul, on account of his independence of the law in his course of conduct, of a contempt of the grace of God, not recognizing, in their confusion of thought, the truth that just this self-elevation of Christ was the chief manifestation of this grace, that therefore every disparagement of that self-devotion to death, by emphasizing the

law, implied a contemning of this grace. This δωρεάν is, in conclusion, a sharply trenchant word. [MEYER: "This death took place unnecessarily, if what it should effect, could be attained through the law. ERASMUS is excellent: *est autem ratiocinatio ab impossibili.*"—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. "*Controversy of Paul with Peter*" is a frequent, but incorrect title of this section. It should rather be entitled: *Peter's weak yielding and Paul's open rebuke of it.* For there is not the slightest mention made of a controversy between the two, and especially none of any opposing reply provoked by Paul.

As regards the fault of Peter, the question, in what it consisted, has been answered in the main above. To express it generally, it was a practical denying of the freer, genuinely evangelical conviction, to which he had attained, and that too from an unworthy motive, namely the fear of man, a fear of the censure of legally-minded Christians (and thus at all events an ὑπόκρισις). This of itself gives an important hint as to how we are to show regard for "the weak," and when we may, out of consideration for them, renounce some particulars of Christian freedom. It is right only when it proceeds not from the fear of men or their censure or in any other way from self-interest, but from indulgent care that scandal be not given, and conscience be not perplexed.—Peter's conduct, however, was particularly indefensible on account of the special circumstances under which it took place; at a time when it was of moment to secure the principal of Christian liberty, "the truth of the gospel," which through Peter's behavior was put in jeopardy: for the Gentile Christians, who were witnesses of it, were thereby induced to suppose that the observing of the Mosaic *law* was something necessary for a Christian, were shaken in their previous Christian conviction. A further important hint as to this regard for the weak! it may be duty, it may also be forbidden, when the fundamental principle of evangelical freedom would thereby be rendered doubtful to any one (or when, on the other hand, it might be perverted so as to establish the legal position, and to support an attack upon evangelical liberty).

The nature of the fault determines also our judgment respecting it. It was a fault: and on this account Paul's correction of it, and that in the way in which it took place, *i. e.*, publicly, before all, was warranted, nay, necessary: necessary, not so much on account of the fear of man betrayed in it, as on account of the perplexity of conscience among the Gentile Christians, which was to be apprehended. This was the reason why Paul took occasion to set forth with such distinctness the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith. That a Peter should be set right by Paul, ill accords with the Romish view of the primacy of Peter. The transaction in Antioch will therefore also be urged with propriety against the assumption of such a primacy. The narrative is also instructive for the just apprehension of the general personal characters of the Apostles, and constitutes a corrective against exaggerated notions of these, as though a shortcoming, and unwarranted step, or even a sin, were never possible in their case.—But on the other side, more must not be made of Peter's fault than it really was. It must not be regarded as anything else than a sin of weakness. If even Peter's denial of his Master, rightly judged, can only be regarded as such, much more, and with entire certainty must this case in Antioch be so regarded, and this case, although in some measures analogous to his denial, is much less scandalous as indeed, considering that meanwhile he had been endued with the Holy Ghost, might be expected. That he strove with the Spirit, is not even to be imagined, *nam quo rectore apostoli utebantur, spiritus sanctus neque sublata illos omni virium humanarum efficientia neque ita moderatus est, ut labe quavis eximerentur vel castigationi fraternæ locus non esset* (ELWERT, p. 16), as little as that sins of weakness generally are impossible in those who have received the Holy Ghost. Moreover, as this lapse of Peter was a lapse in practical conduct, and not in teaching, it cannot be pretended that it overturns faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures. The apostolic dignity of Peter and of his teaching, Paul does not in the least assail, and does not speak of them as impaired; as indeed it is precisely in his teaching on this particular point that Peter here comes into view as occupying the right position, failing of faithfulness to it in his practical behavior only. But in any case, the uncertainty of the senior Apostles respecting the obligation of the law, the existence of which is plainly enough attested by the Acts, does not warrant us in drawing a conclusion as to the truth of apostolic teaching generally. There was in this matter a learning, a growth and advancement to clear knowledge of the evangelical truth: and just in this point the corrective is given and the genuine truth of the gospel shown to us by means of Paul, in whose calling we are not to see a chance, but the significant dispensation of the Head of the Church, who knew her needs. We need not therefore isolate one from the other, but as and because both are given together, they should also be taken together, and out of both together we should gain the full light of evangelical knowledge of the truth. — Least warranted of all is the misuse of this passage to maintain the existence of a standing difference and permanent ill-feeling between Paul and Peter. Their agreement of view appears in a way hardly to be expected in Peter, inasmuch as he too set forth the principle of evangelical freedom (from the law) by his eating in common with the Gentile Christians; and if in consequence of Peter's weakness there arose a difference, nothing whatever points to anything permanent, to any deep division, but what took place in a single case was rebuked by Paul, and the unjustifiableness of this conduct openly demonstrated. The publicity of the rebuke, moreover, is by no means to be regarded merely as making it keener, but as showing no less the *brotherly* way in which the matter was handled, inasmuch as a reproach addressed to Peter in private would have been far more apt to make the impression of a personal strife, and had there been a deeply

seated difference, it were inconceivable that Peter would have suffered himself to be thus publicly rebuked.—As it is important rightly to understand Peter's fault, on the other hand Paul's correction of it must not be misinterpreted; it was not an exaltation of himself, but flowed only from zeal for the "truth of the gospel," for the confirmation of Christian consciences; and the decision with which Paul stood forth in behalf of this without fear of man, is instructive. Although, indeed, not every one is competent to such a procedure, but ordinarily only one who has a public standing, like Paul, yet the principle expressed in his procedure is important, namely, that in matters of faith, no human authorities, however high they stand, can give law, but that their acts remain always subject to the test, according to the norm of "the truth of the gospel."—As the facts here testify against a primacy of Peter, so the ground and warrant of the act of rebuke witness most strongly against the idea of the Papacy in general, and against everything that borders on it under the protection of the principle of authority.

[SCHAFF, *Apost Church*, p. 258, gives the following *resumé:* "This event is full of instruction. We cannot, indeed, justly infer from it anything unfavorable to the inspiration and doctrine of Peter; for his fault was rather a practical denial of his real and true conviction. But it shows that the Apostles, even after the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, are not to be looked upon as perfect saints in such sense as to be liable to no sinful weakness whatever. We here discern still the workings of the old sanguine, impulsive nature of Peter, who could, one hour, with enthusiastic devotion, swear fidelity to his Master; and the next, deny him thrice. Paul, too, on his part, may have been too excited and sharp against the senior Apostle, without making due allowance for the delicacy of his position, and his regard for the scrupulosity of the Jewish converts; which certainly go far to excuse, though not to justify Peter. Then again from the conduct of Paul we learn not only the right and duty of combatting the errors even of the most distinguished servants of Christ, but also the equality of the Apostles, in opposition to an undue exaltation of Peter above his colleagues." On the bearing of this passage against the Papal claim to infallibility, see WORDSWORTH, who makes the error of Peter to have been "imposing unjustifiable terms of communion."—R.]

2. *The Pauline doctrine of Justification.*—We have in this section, in a short dogmatic form, the Pauline doctrine of Justification in the sentence: *οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως* Ἰησοῦ Χρ., "a man is not justified by the works of the law, but [only] by the faith of Jesus Christ."

a) *The idea of "works of the law"* is first to be determined. It does not, for instance, signify merely the observance of ritual prescriptions, and the reason why "a man is not justified by the works of the law," is not that such ceremonial works are not sufficient. For then Paul would simply have directed attention from these works to others (better, or more difficult ones), and not, as he does, have diverted attention from works, altogether to something totally different, namely, "faith." No, as the law itself contains not merely ritual prescriptions, but also precepts peculiarly ethical, undoubtedly the entirely general expression "works of the law," also denotes works of either kind. More accurately—Paul does not divide the law, but takes the law as an integral whole, as a divine institute, which, with all its precepts, the ritual as well as the specially ethical, morally obliges man, and, as an expression of the Divine will, requires and expects obedience from him. (Therefore, even if only ritual observances were meant, yet in reality the ground of non-justification could not be found simply in the externality of these precepts; in them also God has expressed His will; their observance also is to be regarded as a moral service.) "Works of the law," therefore, are generally all works that are done (and are) in conformity with the requisitions of the Divine law.—Yet this is only a preliminary and entirely general definition. For then the question immediately arises: But why then no justification by them? or (since the idea of "being justified" itself still awaits elucidation), why does Paul then point entirely away from them to something entirely different? for thus much at least is implied in it. The common answer is: If man only performed such "works of the law," all would be well, he would then be justified thereby: but this he does not, and cannot do; therefore of course in this way there is no justification possible. But this answer of itself cannot satisfy: it reminds us too strongly of a *lucus a non lucendo;* the "works of the law" would then, strictly speaking, have their name from the fact that they are not performed, from their non-existence. On the other hand a man certainly can (even of himself) do "works of the law," can fulfil moral demands of the law (nay, he can do that much easier than have faith). But what he thereby accomplishes, is only *ἔργα*, "works" (on which account Paul in the Romans instead of *ἔργα νόμου* uses also the abridged expression *ἔργα*), *i. e.*, 1. They are only single, isolated acts of obedience, here an *ἔργον*, there an *ἔργον*, and therefore even if the particular act corresponds to the particular requirement, yet this never completely satisfies the idea of the law, as an integral whole, and all trust in these, therefore, as if one could by these isolated "works" really fulfil the will of God, is perverted trust. The *whole* law=God's will, demands fulfilment. This presents the unsatisfactoriness of the works of the law more particularly as extensive. But 2. it presents it also intensively: the works, even because they are works, are only *external* acts of obedience. But the law demands fulfilment by the *whole* man. "Works of the law" can never satisfy it; and confidence in them, therefore, as if one could endure God's judgment on the ground of these, is always unfounded. The fulfilment of the law requires first and last a *temper of mind* answerable thereto. In the law God requires obedience to His will: to fulfil it, therefore, man must himself be filled with the spirit of this obedience, and that not a merely external, seeming obedience, but a genuine one, whose source is in love to God. But now the fulfilment, both of the former requirement and of this letter, is shipwrecked on the sinfulness of man, in consequence of which he cannot of himself rise

above that want of unity and this externality of his moral acts, in consequence of which he accomplishes only "works of the law," and for that very reason does not attain to *δικαίωσις*. First of all then there would be held up before the man the duty of perfectly fulfilling the law extensively and intensively, in contrast with the mere "works of the law." But this would really accomplish nothing, because the defect is grounded in the sinfulness of man. There is therefore either no *δικαίωσις*, or it must come in an entirely different way, and this way is "the faith of Jesus Christ."

These "works of the law" Paul nowhere calls "good works:" he uses the term "good works" only in the full sense of the word, to denote works which are really good, as being works of faith; which is just what the "works of law" are not, else *δικαίωσις* would come from them, and Faith would be superfluous.—Far less than by these even is the name of "good works" deserved by those "works" which have come up within the Christian period and been imposed as conditions of salvation. These have been only a new form of the "works of the law," and therefore LUTHER, as is well known, found in the Pauline declarations respecting these his most effective weapons against the Romish "works of the law" and the false confidence reposed in them. On the other hand, it is true, he urges most distinctly and forcibly that, as being mere human ordinances, the ecclesiastical "works of the law" do not even stand on an equality with the "works of the law" of the Jews, which at least were commanded by God, and that therefore it is so much the more perverse to trust in them. This is the Roman Catholic form of the "works of the law." But they are perpetually undergoing new transformations, and coming up again with the old pretensions (less and less justified as these continually are), agreeably to the natural leaning of man to a righteousness of works. Especially does he find it easy (to say nothing of observances essentially and from the beginning serving this perverse end) to turn even well intended usages and institutions, in themselves salutary, into a "law," and then to set his trust upon the observance of these. Nay, even the exercises which are meant to further the life of faith as opposed to the legal life, are themselves too often turned again into "works of the law."

b) *Signification of δικαίωσις.* Passing now to *δικαίωσις*, the term of chief import, we ask what is the signification of this?

This question is most easily answered, if we start from Paul's denial: "not by the works of the law." The Jew believes that he *ἐξ ἐργ. ν. δικαιοῦται.* What does this mean, what is expected by the man who believes this? Evidently this belief does not imply his making to himself the *ethical* statement: if I do the "works of the law," I shall be — made righteous (*justus reddor*), that is, by God. For certainly he who does the works of the law, does not expect a subsequent *justum reddi* by God; his doing the works of the law in itself constitutes him and proves him (according to the supposition) a *justus*. He is not therefore expecting, as necessary to this, that God shall first translate him into the moral conditions of a *justus*. No: the thought "justified by the works of the law" conveyed to the Jew the idea of a *judgment* of God pronounced upon him, as being one who accomplished the "works of the law:" and nothing can therefore be better established than the *forensic, declaratory* signification of *δικαιοῦν:* taken, in the first instance, in its most general sense. As to the precise nature of the judgment, it was primarily, simply the sentence: Thou art a *δίκαιος* [righteous, just man.—R.]. This was what the man needed to render complete his living "after the law," and thus *δικαίως*, what he needed to make his claim before the law perfect: namely, the Divine judgment that he was thereby *δίκαιος;* even had he wished to derive from it nothing else than the *certainty* that he was *δίκαιος*. With this he would then have had the lofty, ennobling, and blessed consciousness of God's *taking pleasure* in him, of God's *gracious dispositions* towards him. But the judgment of God, we know, is never, so to speak, a mere judgment in words, but is also a judgment in *deeds*, that is, the favor of God to any one shows itself in actual blessing. To this, to the obtaining of the blessing of God, and averting of His curse, the expectation of him, who occupied himself with the works of the law, was directed, agreeably to the Divine promises. This blessing was, as is known, primarily a temporal one, temporal good fortune and prosperity, the dwelling in the promised land.

If we apply this to the position which the gospel, denying *δικαίωσις ἐξ ἐργ. ν.* assumes: "a man is justified by the faith of Christ," the sense naturally is: the judgment is uttered respecting him who believes on Jesus Christ, that he is *δίκαιος*. (How this is brought about, so that the sentence: Thou art *δίκαιος*, is itself *δίκαιον*, righteous, by reason of the sacrificial death of Christ, is in this passage only intimated, vers. 19, 20, 21, and is elsewhere more explicitly established by Paul.) The main point is first the fact [*das* "*dass*"] of this judgment, namely that the Divine complacency and satisfaction is attested thereby: but then, as intimated above all, the whole weight falls upon the manifestation of this in act, upon the effect of this judgment, and hence, upon the certainty of Divine *Blessing* (instead of curse). This blessing then, it is understood, comprehends a sum of manifestations, partly internal, and enjoyed even in the earthly life, but in part such as are only realized in eternity, and make up the fruition of the heavenly "inheritance." This elucidation makes it clear that *δικαίωσις* is not to be taken as immediately identical with the forgiveness of sins; for the theory of a *δικαιοῦσθαι ἐξ ἐργ. ν.* implies the expectation of a *δικαίωσις* not connected with forgiveness of sins; since the claim is here to a justification founded on a *doing* of the works of the law, and not on a transgression of the law. In this justifying "by the faith of Christ" then, which becomes necessary for the very reason that, on account of our sinfulness being justified, is not possible "by the works of the law" — the forgiveness of sin, of the transgression of the law, is no doubt an integral, nay, more, the fundamental element of the *δικαίωσις*, it is in the full sense an Act of Pardon. — The elements into which the *δικαίωσις* resolves itself, or, if the phrase is preferred, the

consequences which grow out of the δικαίωσις, are then found in detail (partially at least), in chap. iii., (and also in chap. iv.), where the reference to the "Blessing," in opposition to the "curse" (agreeably to our exposition), as well as to the "inheritance," is instructive. And if at the beginning of chap. iii. the receiving of the Holy Ghost is described as an effect of "faith" (as opposed to the works of the law), it is unwarrantable to urge this against the forensic, declaratory sense of justification, as if it signified an internal transformation, a translation from the flesh into the Spirit, *etc.* For the immediate reference here is to the receiving of the Spirit as a Divine *blessing*, the communication of a gracious benefit, as a sign and evidence of the Divine good will, an evidence of pardon. This gift of the Spirit, it is indisputably true, creates a new life, and it is given to this end, but this view is second in order.—Nay, this new life itself is also to be regarded as a Divine grace. Δικαιοῦν therefore is an effective act only in the above named sense, that God's approving judgment is shown also in act, or that God's judgment consists in real blessings. It is not an effective act in the sense that δικαιοῦν of itself *signifies* an *infusio justitiæ* of any sort, new life, or the like.—Unquestionably the "faith of Jesus Christ" leads not merely to δικαίωσις, but also to a new "living with Christ," which is grounded upon a "dying with Christ" (of which there is a brief mention of this section vers. 19, 20). But this is not comprehended in δικαίωσις as Paul uses it; for this idea he has the entirely different turn of thought and expression quoted above. Therefore no one should confound what Paul expressly keeps apart (*e. g.*, as he plainly does in the relation of Rom. vi. to the preceding chapters). Δικαιωθῆναι is not identical with the origination of a new life. In this passage especially (ver. 19 sq.) Paul's allusion to the new life that had arisen in him through faith in Jesus Christ, serves, strictly speaking, only as a reason why he no longer seeks δικαίωσις through the "works of the law," but through faith in Christ. Through the crucifixion with Christ the man of the law has been slain in him, and a new man has arisen who lives in "faith in Christ." The new man therefore is he who knows his δικαίωσις to be grounded on faith in Christ. It is a sign of the new man, it belongs to his nature to live "in the faith of Jesus Christ," and to seek and find in that, instead of in the law, his δικαίωσις. But it does not follow from this that δικαιωθῆναι means the same as to become a new man.

But, allowing that δικαίωσις is not to be identified with the origination of a new life, does not the latter precede the δικαίωσις, and is it not, not unfrequently, the material ground of it? This brings us

c) *To the idea of "faith," and its relation to justification.* "The faith of Jesus Christ" leads to justification, and this alone does not the [wor]ks of the law, is what Paul declares with such distinctness. But in what way? Has Faith this effect inasmuch as, according to what has been touched upon above, the believer appropriates to himself the death and the life of Christ = the old man is slain and a new one planted in him, so that God, with reference to this, even though the new life is only in its beginning, yet recognizing in the beginning the guarantee of the rest, acquits him of sin, and bestows upon him blessing and grace, that is justifies him in the forensic sense, and then implants in him still further such life, with the effective method of the justification? This must be denied decidedly: for this simple reason, that otherwise the ground of justification, in the mind of God, would consist in something else than that which the faith of the believer apprehends as its ground, and so his faith would really be an illusion. For 1. "The believer believes on Christ," is equivalent to saying that he recognizes in Christ, and particularly in Christ's sacrificial death, the ground of his justification. 2. The believer, through his faith in Christ, undoubtedly comes to a new life, but this life is and abides, as our passage itself shows, essentially and above all a life in faith, and in faith on Christ's death (ver. 20); in the conviction of being justified before God by this death, from which then follows a life according to God's will in the special ethical sense, and transformation of the whole direction of the will. The real ground of justification, therefore, cannot consist in the believer's new life itself, but in that in which he himself, renouncing the works of the law, seeks and continually finds it, namely, in Christ's atoning death. Else were he entangled in a delusion. And faith justifies simply because it is, as it were, our unreserved assent to the reconciliation already effected in Christ. It needs only that, for through the atoning death of Christ, provided any one will not deny its value, the grace of God is already won for us all; therefore, there remains nothing on our part but to say Yes to it (*manus apprehendens*). Without this, that grace cannot become our own; through it, it does become our own, since an earning of it, or a making ourselves worthy of it, is no longer needful; but, on the contrary, every such thought derogates somewhat from the merit of Christ. Nothing further then is needed than just this "believing;" we need not fancy this too little when taken in its simple sense = "to trust," "to place confidence in," and we need not suppose we must first make its idea as it were more complete by taking in its effects, in order to be able to acknowledge faith as the condition* of justification. Were faith to be made more than the condition of justification, were it to be made its ground, we might intensify its idea as much as we would, it would still be too little. But now, as on the one hand, Faith utters its Amen to the reconciliation accomplished in Christ, and thus makes the man partaker of it,—that is, justifies him, so does it also lay hold of this death itself, which has wrought for it so great a benefit = the man who has heretofore lived, dies with Christ and through Christ, but there comes instead (not out of faith, but out of Christ, yet not without faith), a new man, who lives to God, but ever henceforth seeks the ground of God's favor in nothing else than in Christ. This trust comes more and more completely into exercise with the new life that springs up, instead of being now superfluous. (This is the double hand of faith.)

* [There need be no mistake about the meaning of "condition" here: *conditio sine qua non.*—R.]

By what is said above, the idea of faith is not in any way unduly weakened. Even though man can do nothing more than *apprehendere* what is in God and Christ, yet this very *apprehendere* is the greatest and especially the hardest thing that (sinful) man can do. For it implies nothing less than a giving of all honor to God, and not to one's self, a willingness to renounce one's own reason, one's own merits, one's own will. Hence, even this man cannot have of himself, but God must bring him thereto. And he does it by the pedagogy of the "law" "unto Christ." On this, see the next chapter, although it is already intimated in ver. 19 of this.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 11–13.—Starke:—The Apostles also had their faults, and sometimes committed great errors of conduct (1 John i. 8). What? Are ministers then, whose authority is so much less than that of the Apostles, to be expected not to err and sin? Therefore, follow them no further than they follow Christ.—Even though a thing be done with good intention, yet, so far as it is wrong in itself, or as any scandal arises thereby, it cannot be excused or defended by its good intention. When of two evils one must be chosen, it is better to let a scandal arise than to do anything that may prejudice evangelical truth.—Even children of God and great saints are capable of being very easily and suddenly surprised and overcome by the fear of man, when they do not sufficiently watch over themselves.—Hedinger:—When faults, scandals in doctrine and life are prevalent, it is not for us to be silent, to strike sail and run before the wind, but to stand fast in our place.—Quesnel: —The higher one stands, the more measured and guarded his conduct should be.

[Calvin:—How cautiously we ought to guard against giving way to the opinions of men, lest we turn aside from the right path! If this happened to Peter, how much more easily to us.—Luther:—Such examples are written for our consolation. If Peter fell, I may likewise fall. If he rose again, I may also rise again. This comfort they take away, who say, the saints do not sin.—This is a wonderful matter! God preserved the church, being yet young, and the gospel, by one person. Paul alone standeth to the truth, for he had lost Barnabas, his companion, and Peter was against him. So sometimes one man is able to do more in a council than the whole council besides.—R.]

[Burkitt:—Such as sin openly, must be reproved openly.—No bands of friendship must keep the ministers of God from reproving sin. A notorious fault must be reproved with much boldness and resolution. If such as are eminent in the church fall, they fall not alone; many do fall with them.—What a constraining power there is in the example of eminent persons. He is said to compel, in Scripture, not only who doth violently force, but who, being of authority, doth provoke by his example.—The errors of those that do rule, become rulers of error. Men sin through a kind of authority, through the sins of those who are in authority.—R.]

[How many rejoice at Paul's defence of the liberty of the gospel against Peter's weakness, who themselves will not receive rebuke as Peter did—nay, are very popes at heart. For there are popes in pews as well as in pulpits, besides the pope who openly claims to be such; Christian liberty suffers from them all.—The fear of man, of popular opinion often becomes to us as authoritative as decrees and Papal bulls to others.—Peter will not commune with Gentile Christians longer; so he might act if he would, as Peter, but as an Apostle, he thus made terms of communion against the truth of the gospel. He was condemned; do we never seek to bind the conscience not only "in meats and drinks," but as respects communion with other Christians?—When such conduct ceases to be a private choice, and becomes public scandal, it should be rebuked by one set for the defence of the truth of the gospel.—The yet remaining power of narrow national and social and religious prejudices in those who profess Christ as "all and in all." How strong in Peter; once so strong in Paul, but now crucified with Christ.—R.]

Ver. 14. Spener:—The whole life of Christians has, besides God's glory, the end and aim that the truth of the gospel and pure doctrine may be established; those sins, therefore, are great above others, whereby any may be misled as to the truth of the gospel.—Starke:—So soon as it is taught by words or deeds that anything more is necessary to salvation than the grace of God and faith, so soon is the truth of the gospel wounded.—In the matter of scandals, one who either maliciously or heedlessly causes them, has justly reckoned against him and imputed by God, what thereafter arises out of them, and thus the sin may become more grievous through its consequences.—Rieger:—O God! if I ever err, give me a frankspoken Paul to warn me and make me on the spot or afterwards as mild in yielding, as Peter!—Heubner:—Things that trouble peace may arise even among children and messengers of God. In Acts xiii. 13. xv. 31, similar things are mentioned. Behold the imperfection of the earthly life! only above is harmony forever undisturbed. The kingdom of Christ, nevertheless, advances even through weak instruments.

Public rebuke: 1. admissible, yes, necessary, when anything has been done that perplexes consciences; 2. how shall it be conducted? Undoubtedly by free exposition of its evil consequences, but then chiefly by renewed and more thorough assertion of the truth of the Gospel: not with personal reproaches; and above all, in brotherly love; 3. difficult; therefore examine thyself well, whether thou be called or at all events fitted therefor, that thou destroy not more good than thou restorest; and if thou perceivest thyself not skilled, leave it: for after all it is not thou that rebukest and God knows well enough how to choose His own instruments. In all cases do it not without earnest looking up to God, that in the discharge of it He will keep thee as from the fear of man, so none the less from vanity, haughtiness and a loveless temper.

Ver. 15. Starke:—The preëminence which we who are born of Christian ancestry have above others, must not be misused to the prejudice of divine grace; we must be none the less certain that the grace of Christ alone, not our descent from Christian parents, can save us.

Ver. 16. LUTHER:—Understand we this article rightly and purely? Then have we the true heavenly sun. But if we lose it, we have nothing else than a hellish darkness.—A troubled, wretched conscience should keep no thought or remembrance of the law, nor should oppose to the anger and judgment of God anything else than the sweet comforting word of Christ, which is a word of grace, of forgiveness of sins, of everlasting life and blessedness. But to do this is especially hard. For the fearfulness of the conscience keeps us from well apprehending Christ, and temps us often to let Him go, and to fall back upon the thought of law and sin.—As a Jew, through the works which he does after God's law, cannot be justified, how then should a monk be justified, by his order, a priest by his authority, a philosopher by his skill and wisdom, a sophistical theologian by his sophistry? Wise, pious, and righteous as men may become on earth through their reason and God's law, yet they are by all their works, merits, masses, and by the best of all their righteousness and acts of worship, not righteous before God.—RIEGER:—What thou art by nature and canst boast concerning thy good bringing up, thy refined education, thy works of the law, distinguish thee doubtless above many others. Thou art not bidden to throw that entirely away. What of quiet days, and advantage to thy health, and the like this secures to thee, enjoy. But into the secret chamber of judgment, where God and the conscience have to do with one another concerning the forgiveness of sins, this is not to intrude. Through no work of the law shall we ever bring it to pass that God will justify us, forgive our sins, bestow on us access to His grace, and the hope of future glory; that we learn alone from God's word and promise in Christ.

Ver. 17. RIEGER:—If I would suffer this thing again to become uncertain to me, namely, that I, leaving all works behind, should be justified through Christ alone; if I would be mistrustful about that, as if I had brought myself into sin by such a disparagement of works; if I fell back again upon works, as chanced to Peter, I should make Christ a minister of sin.—LUTHER:—Every one who teaches that faith in Christ doth not justify, unless a man also keep the law, such a one makes Christ a minister of sin, *i. e.* he makes out of him a law-teacher, who teaches just that, and nothing else that Moses teaches. So can Christ then be no Saviour and grace-giver, but would be only a cruel tyrant, who required of us merely impossible things, not one of which any man can fulfil. [For the other view of this passage see EXEG. NOTES. — BURKITT: — The Apostle rejects the inference of the adversaries of the doctrine of justification by faith with the greatest abhorrence and detestation. It is no new prejudice, though a very unjust one, against this doctrine of justification by faith alone, that it opens a door to licentiousness and makes Christ the minister of sin.—R.]

Ver. 18. STARKE:—Teachers should take good care, that what they tear down with one hand, that they may not build up again with the other.

Ver. 19. RIEGER.—I have not run away from the law like an escaped rogue. It has cost a death, I have made trial of the law before, and learnt well, how far the law carries us, and what is impossible to it. But now, as in the case of a marriage dissolved by death, I am lawfully divorced from the law. I have no desire to knit this bond again.—LUTHER:—St. Paul could have said nothing of mightier force against the righteousness that is supposed to come through the law, than just what he here saith: I have died to the law, I have nothing at all more to do with it, it concerns me nothing, nor can it justify me.—These words are most full of comfort, and let them come in mind to any one in time of temptations and afflictions, and be in his heart rightly and thoroughly understood. Such a one would without doubt be well able to stand against all danger and dread of death, against all manner of terrors of conscience and of sin, though they fell as vehemently upon him as ever they could.—Happy he who, when his conscience falls into distress and temptation, that is, when sin assails and the law accuses him, then can say: What matters that to me; for I have died to thee. But if thou wilt ever dispute with me concerning sins, go, bury thyself with the flesh and its members, my servants pass then in review, plague and crucify them as thou wilt; but me, the conscience, it is for thee to leave, in peace as queen. For thou hast no concern with me since I have died to thee and live now to Christ.—It is a strange, curious, and unheard of speech, that to live to the law is as much as to die to God, and to die to the law as much as to live to God. These two sentences are completely and entirely athwart the reason, therefore also no sophist as law teacher can understand them. But do thou give diligence that thou learn well to understand them, namely thus, that who now will live to the law, that is, practise himself in its works, and keep the same, in order that he may thereby be justified, such a one is a sinner and abides a sinner, and therefore condemned to everlasting death and damnation. For the law can make him neither righteous nor blessed, but if it begins to accuse him in right earnest, it only kills him. Therefore to live to the law is, in truth, nothing else than to die to God, and to die to the law is nothing else than to live to God; now to live to God, this is to become righteous through grace and faith on Christ, without any works or law.—STARKE:—The end of our freedom from the law is not, that we may live to ourselves, but that we may live to God and Christ.

Ver. 20. In STARKE:—Christ on His cross was to be regarded as the surety and head of the whole human race: therefore, in His person the whole human race was also crucified. Especially have believers part in the death of Christ, because faith brings with it a perfect union and fellowship between Christ and the faithful.—BERLENB. BIBLE:—Faith binds us to the cross of Christ, and there nothing of the old man will remain and be spared. Faith and the cross are to one another very near. Therefore, worldly wisdom turns its back on faith. Many with their faith will even separate the cross from itself; they make of faith a cross before the cross, and say of the other, away, away with it!—This is the method of stepping over from the law to the gospel, only through the death of the old

Adam, and his peculiar life. It makes a huge corpse. "I live."—No more after my own willing and working, but in another spirit. We must lose ourselves. A man lives then most blessedly, when he lives not to himself. There must be in the heart another I. The old I must lose itself. But what says the self-love and selfishness that would gladly keep its life, and seek in everything what pleases it, that will not hate its own soul, affections, desires, dispositions, and sensual cravings? Its word is: That am I! that is from me! that is in me! therefore, that is mine! that befits me! that pleases me! that is so with me! It demands, therefore, from God and man rest, life, love, honor, obedience, trust, help, assistance, comfort, and enjoyment. O what a heavy stone of stumbling is self-love in Christ's way!—[BUNYAN:—They only have benefit by Christ to eternal life, who die by His example, as well as live by His blood; for in His death was both merit and example; and they are like to miss in the first, that are not concerned in the second.—R.]

LUTHER:—The very life that I live is Christ Himself, and therefore Christ and I are in this matter altogether one thing. None the less, it is true, there remains outwardly cleaving to me the old man that is under the law, but so far as concerns this matter, namely, that I be justified before God, Christ and I cannot but be bound in the closest wise together, so that He lives in me and I again in Him.—Christ and my conscience should become one body, so that I should keep nothing else before my eyes than Jesus Christ. But if I turn my countenance away from Christ, and look alone upon myself, it is at once all over with me. For then straightway flashes into my mind: Christ is above in heaven, and thou here below on earth, how wilt thou now find the way up to Him? Then the reason quickly answers: I will lead a holy life, and do what the law bids me, and so enter into life. But when I thus look upon myself, and consider only what I am, or what I ought to be, and what I am bound to do, I lose Christ forthwith out of my sight, who yet alone is my righteousness and life; but when I have lost Him, there is no longer either help or counsel, but at the last desperation and eternal damnation must needs follow.—BERLENB. BIBLE:—Christ is life not for Himself alone, but a benefit that willingly and freely communicates itself. Where now it finds a man who hates and forsakes his own life, and lives no longer in his own self-love, in him Christ lives.—RIEGER:—If a man should hear of the fellowship of the cross of Christ alone, a man might form to himself too joyless an image of my religion: but it is also a fellowship with His life. And my life in the flesh, my tarrying upon this battlefield of sin and grace, is given me for a proof how the Son of God once made a journey through the world, and remained constant to His Heavenly Father.

[JOHN BROWN:—Paul here declares his experience. The law has no more to do with me, and I have no more to do with it in the matter of justification.—Christ died and in Him I died; Christ revived and in Him I revived. The law has killed me, and by doing so, it has set me free from itself. The life I now have, is not the life of a man under the law, but the life of a man delivered from the law.—*Christ's* relations to God are *my* relations. His views are my views; His feelings my feelings. He is the soul of my soul, the life of my life. My state, my sentiments, my conduct are all Christian.—"It is but right that I should be entirely devoted to Him who devoted Himself entirely for me."—R.]

LUTHER:—It is very true that I still live in the flesh, but be it now what life it may, that is still in me, I count it yet for no life at all; for it is, if one will view it aright, indeed no life, but rather a mask, under which another lives, namely Christ, who is truly my life, that thou canst not see, but hearest it alone. I live, to be sure, in the flesh; but I live not from the flesh or after the flesh, but in faith, from faith, and according to faith.—"Who loved me and gave Himself for me." With these words Paul describes in most comforting wise Christ's office and priesthood. This now is His office, that He should reconcile us with God, give Himself up for our sins, &c. Therefore, thou must not make of Him a new law-giver that does away the old law and establishes a new in its place. Christ is no Moses, no taskmaster and lawgiver, but a grace-giver and compassionate Saviour. He is nothing else than a purely measureless and overflowing compassion, that suffers itself to be bestowed upon us, and also bestows itself. Setting forth Christ after such a way, thou rightly depictest Him. But if thou suffer Him to be portrayed to thee in other guise, thou mayest, in the time of temptation, be easily and quickly overthrown.—These words of Paul are an excellent example of a genuine and assured faith.—Accustom thyself to this, that thou apprehend this brief word. "me," with certain faith, and doubtest not thereof, that thou also art in the number of those who are named with this little word "me." For, as we cannot deny that we are one and all sinners, so can we also not deny that Christ died for our sins, that He might justify us through His death. For surely He has not died for this, that He should justify those that were righteous before, but that He should help poor sinners. Because then I feel and confess that I am a sinner, why should I not, on the other hand, also say that I am righteous because of Christ's righteousness, especially because I hear that He has loved ME and given Himself for ME. St. Paul believed it steadfastly and assuredly, and, therefore, also does he speak of it so freely and confidently. But may He who hath loved us and given Himself for us, bestow on us grace, that we may be able, if only in part, to do the like and speak thus concerning ourselves.—[LIGHTFOOT:—Paul appropriates to himself, as CHRYSOSTOM observes, the love which belongs equally to the whole world. For Christ is, indeed, the personal friend of each man individually; and is as much to him as if He had died for him alone.—R.]

Ver. 21. STARKE:—The rejection of the grace of God, may take place: 1. by a denial of the perfect satisfaction of Christ; 2. by setting along side of it our own merits, worthiness and righteousness, as Popery does in doctrine, and many even in our churches do in fact; 3. by abusing

this grace to favor presumption, and to supersede sanctification; 4. when even sincere souls, in the feeling of their unworthiness, are much too timorous to appropriate grace to themselves, and think they must first have arrived at this or that degree of holiness, before grace can avail them any thing; 5. when tempted ones from a lack of feeling conclude that they have fallen out of grace again.

Luther:—The righteousness that comes from the law is nothing else than mere contempt and rejection of God's grace, whereby the death of Christ becomes unworthy and unavailing. Who is, indeed, so eloquent that he can sufficiently portray and bring to light, what it is to reject the grace of God? or to make out that Christ has died in vain? It is hard to have to talk of any useless dying; but to say that Christ has died in vain, that is too much, that is quite too villanous a word, for it is nothing less than to say that Christ is wholly unprofitable, is nothing worth.—If any one will make out Christ's death an unprofitable thing, he must also make His resurrection, His glorious triumph over sin, death, *etc.*, His kingdom, heaven, earth, God Himself, God's majesty and glory, and in brief all things together contemptible and useless.—These great, mighty, and terrible thunderclaps, which St. Paul in his writings brings down from heaven against our own righteousness, that comes from the law, ought, by good right, to terrify us from it.—When the world hears such a charge, it will not at all believe that it is true; for it does not allow that a man's heart could be so wicked that he should reject the grace of God, and count Christ's death a despicable thing, and yet for all that, this sin is of all in the world the most common. Whoever will be righteous outside of faith in Christ, such a one casts away God's grace, and despises the death of Christ, though in words he speak as highly and honorably thereof, as ever he knows how to speak.

Vers. 19–21. To live to God, our end; 1. What is thereby required? 2. Condition of accomplishing it; the way thereto is dying—to the law: this again is possible only through being crucified with Christ.—To be crucified with Christ: 1. something difficult, requires nothing less than that we place ourselves under God's sentence of condemnation; 2. indispensably necessary: else there can be no life to God.—To die with Christ—to live to God; this is the pregnant definition of true Christianity.—I live, yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: a bold expression; but so must it be in the case of a Christian; one's own Ego must vanish, and in place of it Christ must rule in us.—Christ lives in me: 1. can we say so, when even yet there is much sin in us? 2. When can we say so? when at least it is He, in whom alone we seek our righteousness? The Christian's life a double life: *a.* Proof: 1. the joyful attestation: Christ lives in me; 2. he must humbly acknowledge and in manifold ways experience; I yet live in the flesh. *b.* What is to be done, that he, so long as he lives and whatever his life in the flesh, may not live to the flesh, but to Him who, *etc.*—Living in faith on the Son of God, who loved us, and gave Himself for us: 1. the blessed prerogative, 2. the sacred duty of the Christian.—In Lisco:—The life in the faith of the Son of God: 1. what it presupposes in us. Ver. 19: the death of the old natural life—the being crucified with Christ; 2. wherein it essentially consists? Ver. 20: in entire self-surrender to the Son of God, in being filled and permeated with His love, which to the true Christian is the one moving spring of all his actions; 3. what value has it? Ver. 21, it serves to the glory of the grace of God, and the praise of the death of Christ.

To say Christ has also loved *me*, and given Himself for *me*, is the height of faith's achievements, simple as it appears.—Reject not the grace of God! an admonition as earnest as needful.—To reject God's grace the greatest of all sins. When is this done? (see above.)—Christ died in vain? 1. that cannot be; such a deed of love *must* have a high end; 2. and yet for how many has He died in vain!—Christ would have died in vain! the severest condemnation possible of every kind of righteousness of works.—To seek righteousness from works; as foolish (for Christ *cannot* have died in vain), as simple (it rejects that which was God's own most glorious work of Love). ["Then Christ died without cause." Did such a person *die*. Then while we may account for His life by other theories, there is no sufficient reason for His death, save that which Paul preached: Full pardon, entire salvation, to every one who by faith lays hold of Christ as dying for him. Any other view is inconsistent with God's wisdom, frustrates God's grace as well.—Self-salvation must ever deny a sufficient purpose in that death.—R.]

II.

PAUL OPPOSES THE LEGAL VIEW ITSELF, WHICH THROUGH THE FALSE TEACHERS HAD FOUND ENTRANCE AMONG THE GALATIANS.

CHAPTER III. 1—VI. 10.

A. Remonstrance and expression of astonishment, at the contradiction into which this brings them with their own experience respecting the receiving of the Spirit.

(CHAPTER iii. 1–5.)

1 O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched [did bewitch][1] you, that ye should not
obey the truth [omit this clause][2] before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been [was][3] evi-
2 dently set forth, crucified among you [set forth among you, crucified]?[4] This only
would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law [was it by
the works of the law that ye received the Spirit],[5] or by the hearing of faith?
3 Are ye so foolish? having begun in [with][6] the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by
4 [being made[7] perfect with] the flesh? Have ye suffered [or experienced][8] so many
5 things in vain? if *it be* yet [really] in vain. He therefore that ministereth to you
the Spirit, and worketh miracles among [or miraculous powers in][9] you *doeth he it* by
the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?

[1] Ver. 1.—[As a rule the English simple past tense is the better rendering of the Greek aorist.—R.]

[2] Ver. 1.—Τῇ ἀληθ. μὴ πείθεσθαι is to be omitted with Lachmann and Tischendorf. A gloss from Gal. v. 7. [Omitted in ℵ. A. B. and others; by Meyer, Alford, Ellicott. Wordsworth, Lightfoot.—R.]

[3] Ver. 1.—Ἐν ὑμῖν is probably to be retained, on account of its difficulty, with D. E. F. L. K., although it is wanting in ℵ. A. B. C. and omitted by Lachmann. [The uncial authority for it is not much stronger than for the clause above, but its omission is so much more readily accounted for than its insertion, that it is retained by Meyer, Ellicott, Wordsworth. Alford rejects it. Lightfoot is doubtful.—R.]

[4] Ver. 1.—[The E. V. by putting "among you" after "crucified," destroys not only the emphasis which belongs to the latter, but also the proper connection of the former phrase.—R.]

[5] Ver. 2.—[The order of the Greek, given above, is to be preserved, as rendering the contrast more striking.—R.]

[6] Ver. 3.—[The E. V. renders the datives in this clause differently. Πνεύματι . . . σαρκί, not "in the Spirit" and "by the flesh," but "with the Spirit," "with the flesh."—R.]

[7] Ver. 3.—[Ἐπιτελεῖσθε, passive, not middle, "being made complete," not "completing yourselves."—R.]

[8] Ver. 4—[The meaning of ἐπάθετε is open to discussion. Schmoller renders "*erfahren*." See EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[9] Ver. 5.—[Δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν; the two interpretations of this phrase are indicated above. See EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **O foolish Galatians.**—Direct address. because Paul now, for the first time after his historical account, turns to the readers. It is, therefore, a trustworthy intimation that a new section begins here, and that all which precedes belonged together. "Foolish:" that they had given up the better, genuine knowledge, is what Paul wishes to prove to them in the whole Epistle; this is, in fact, implied in the very opening words, chap. i. 6. His particular motive for expressing himself precisely thus here, and in general for expressing himself with especial emphasis, is that, although a new section begins here, yet, for the writer, this beginning presupposes what precedes—that is, in the first instance the proof of the full apostolicity of his preaching generally, and then particularly the just cited rebuking of Peter for conduct similar to theirs, concluding with the powerful words: "For, if righteousness come by the law, then Christ died without cause." This very thought, so painful, that the Galatians, by their conduct, are declaring the greatest act of God's grace, the death of Christ, to have been in vain, may have been what impelled him to the vehement exclamation: ὠ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται. For here also his astonishment and his censure have primary reference to this death of Christ: "set before you, crucified." [JEROME and others have imagined a national peculiarity to be referred to here, which is altogether inadmissible. The Galatians were sprightly, not stupid, and ἀνόητος marks not so much "dullness" as "foolishness," want of νοῦς, improper use of it. They were not μωροί, but ἀνόητοι.—R.] **Who did bewitch you?**—So senseless and therefore incomprehensible is the apostasy of the Galatians, that Paul explains their being led astray as an effect of magic. For what he immediately subjoins had actually taken place among them; naturally, therefore, this apostasy—to Judaism—was least

to be expected of them. For Christ's atoning death and Judaistic legalism are at opposite poles to each other; the stronger the emphasis laid on the former, the most distant must be any thought of the latter. Comp. ii. 21. [LIGHTFOOT:—"The word βασκάνειν originally referred to witchery by spells and incantations, but in actual use it denotes the blighting influence of the evil eye. It here involves two ideas: 1) The baleful effect on the recipient, and 2) the envious spirit of the agent. The false teachers envy the Galatians this liberty in Christ, have an interest in subjecting them again to bondage. This idea, however, is subordinate to the other." See WORDSWORTH, who quotes authorities for both ideas. There may be allusion to the notion that the power of the sorcerer was felt whenever the eye of the recipient rested on him,* in the expression "before whose eyes," as if keeping their eyes on that object would have preserved them from this bewitching; but this must not be pressed.—R.]

Before whose eyes Jesus Christ was evidently set forth.—Portrayed before the eyes, of course, by means of preaching, but the expression hints at the pains which Paul took to make known to them the **crucified** One, and to bring Him as near as possible to them. This is done designedly, in order to contrast the more strongly with this the apostasy that had taken place, and to justify the astonishment which he expresses.—**Among you** strengthens the statement still further: in the midst of you, by oral communication, not merely from a distance by letters. The following is the simplest explanation: "Before your eyes," so distinctly points out the meaning; "to paint," as that of προεγράφη, that we cannot hesitate to accept it, although the compound verb does not occur elsewhere in this sense. WIESELER: "But as γράφειν is very frequently used of painting, there is little occasion for hesitation in extending the signification to the regularly formed compound, even though there were no further warrant for it. In the New Testament there are other ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, both in form and meaning, and as to the latter in this case we have also the voice of the Greek Fathers." To give προ a temporal reference [MEYER, ALFORD, and others. —R.] is less suited to the context, while the local signification corresponds with "before whose eyes." [The safest rendering is that of the E. V. LIGHTFOOT says of the verb: "This is the common word to describe all public notices and proclamations; hence: *programme;*" and this is, on the whole, preferable. WORDSWORTH finds here an allusion to the heathen practice of carrying amulets to guard against witchcraft, and to the Jewish custom of binding phylacteries between the eyes. "Who bewitched you, before whose eyes was written and bound up by me, as your frontlet of Faith, your spiritual Phylactery, *Christ crucified;* and who had, as I thought, been thus guarded by me against all the envious fascination of your spiritual enemies." This is ingenious, but it presses unduly the allusion in the word "bewitched."—R.]

Ver. 2. **This only would I learn of you.**—The unreasonableness of the apostasy is still further, and now, indeed, for the first time, expressly exposed. Not merely has the proclamation of Christ's death on the cross been made among them, but, through faith thereon, they have already attained to the receiving of the Holy Ghost,—and yet are you disposed to turn away from that which has already so attested itself? "*Vide, quam efficaciter tractat locum ab experientia.*" LUTHER. ["Learn" = obtain information, not used ironically in the stricter sense of "learning as a disciple," as LUTHER, BENGEL, and others.—R.] He refers them to the receiving of the Spirit through faith, as a proof that it is *Faith* which works justification. For the Spirit can only be given by God to the man whom He justifies (not whom He reprobates); the gift of the Spirit is a token of grace, not of wrath.—"Only," for this is the main question; by this—so far as the proof is to be sustained by facts—the thing is proved.—**The Spirit**, generally, not merely as the principle of miraculous gifts; "for Paul reminds the collective body of his readers of their receiving of the Spirit; not till ver. 5 are the δυνάμεις, as a species of the Spirit's workings, particularly cited." MEYER. —**By the hearing of faith.**—"Through the preaching concerning faith," is the right translation, although not quite congruous with the first member, which has a subjective reference. ['Ακοή, "hearing," has a passive sense always in the New Testament, *i. e.*, it refers to what is heard (see MEYER, ELLICOTT), "the preaching." —Πίστεως, "of faith," evidently an objective genitive. See LIGHTFOOT, WORDSWORTH, against both the above positions. Most modern expositors agree with Schmoller's next remark on the meaning of πίστις.—R.] Not = "through listening to the faith," since πίστις is never = *doctrina fidei*, but is only the subjective believing. "That in the first member of the double question their own strength, and, in the second, the power of the gospel (= of preaching) is made prominent, is quite natural, as it was through human strength that the Judaizing teachers would fain achieve that which was in truth only to be bestowed by the might of the gospel." WIESELER That the "hearing" was *accepted* is understood, of course, since, from the "hearing," the gift of the Spirit proceeded (comp. Rom. x. 17); from preaching (*sc.* from believing) comes faith, and with it the Holy Ghost.

Ver. 3. **Having begun with the Spirit.**—You have made a beginning in the Christian life through the receiving of the Holy Ghost (ver. 2). Where a beginning is made, the next question is about the completion. Now—remarks Paul with cutting irony, bringing home the sense of this ἀνόητον of their conduct—such a completion there is also with you; but **with the flesh!** *i. e.*, according to your and your false teachers' fancy, this now is the true completion; yet, in truth, it is no completion, but the direct opposite of it, an annihilation of the work begun, because it is a completion with the flesh. "Flesh" is the opposite of "Spirit," and where the "flesh" reigns, the "Spirit" must

[* Coleridge paints this in his wierd lines:
"So deeply had she drunken in
That look, those shrunken, serpent eyes,
That all her features were resigned
To this sole image in her mind." *Lady Christabel.*—R.]

give way. "The flesh," of course, rises again to dominion, where there is a retrogression to the legal position; for therewith the Holy Ghost, which has been obtained only through faith, is necessarily lost; and where the "Spirit" is wanting, there is the "flesh." [MEYER:—"*Spirit* and *flesh* do not describe Christianity and Judaism themselves, but the specific vital agencies in each, the Holy Spirit, and the unspiritual, corporeally-physical human nature, leading contrary to God and to sin." The datives are both modal, indicating the manner in which the two actions took place.—R.] Ἐπιτελεῖν signifies not merely "to end," but "to complete," *consummare.* Ἐπιτελεῖσθε may be middle; if so, then it is simplest to take it as = do ye now bring to completion (*s. c.* the work begun) in the flesh. But ἐπιτελεῖσθαι does not occur in the New Testament in a middle sense, though it is thus used by profane writers. Hence, others take it as passive, *e. g.* MEYER = you are brought to completion, *sc.*, by the false teachers, inasmuch as they make of you people who lie under the dominion of the "flesh." This renders the reproach still sharper. So also LUTHER: instead of saying, *carne consummastis*, he suddenly turns the address, and says: *carne consummamini*, which strictly signifies: Will you then let the matter be carried through with you in the flesh, and thereby be made completely righteous?—The present tense denotes that the Galatians are now engaged in this ἐπιτελεῖσθαι. Comp. i. 6.—Νῦν = *cum magis magisque deberetis spirituales fieri relicta carne.* BENGEL.

Ver. 4. [**Are ye so foolish?**—"So very foolish are ye then?" οὕτως being emphatic.—R.] **Have you experienced** [**or suffered**] **so many things in vain?**—MEYER, in connection with his explanation of "being made perfect," interprets it as referring to the many burdensome performances connected with observing the law, which they had been obliged, by their new teachers, to undergo, in order, according to their notion, to become complete Christians. Having (according to MEYER) reminded them of these by ἐπιτελ, he then lays before them the uselessness of such things by the exclamation (not question): "So many things," *etc.*—This is evidently a strained interpretation, and it is, by no means, probable that this would have been described as a παθεῖν, or even that any such παθεῖν is to be presumed to have taken place. It is, therefore, to be understood, either of sufferings and persecutions, that they underwent, on account of their faith, or, since nothing is otherwise known of such, παθεῖν is to be taken as *vox media*, with the general signification, "to experience," here "to experience manifestations of Divine grace." [While the use of the aorist seems conclusive against the view of MEYER, it is more difficult to decide which of the other two interpretations is to be taken. Though nothing be known of such "sufferings," yet what more likely to occur? And if these arose from Judaizing influences, as was generally the case in Apostolic times, additional point is given to the Apostle's language. The other view, however, seems to give a greater logical unity to the passage, since vers. 3 and 5 both refer to "benefits." But was not Paul, who gloried in tribulation, likely to cite "sufferings" also as evidences of spiritual benefits? These considerations, in connection with the fact that there is no other instance in the New Testament of such a neutral meaning of πάσχειν, render it more prudent to follow the ancient versions and expositors, and adopt "suffered," instead of "experienced."—R.]

If it be only [**or really**] **in vain.**—That is, if rather you are not in much worse case, as notorious backsliding is apt to make the man worse than he was before. This addition has special force against the interpretation of ἐπάθετε as denoting persecutions, as with this it gives a scarcely intelligible sense: for the mitigating thought, that perhaps the Galatians will yet bethink themselves, so that the παθεῖν will not have been in vain, can hardly be in Paul's mind here, where he meditates only severe rebuke [?], while the explanation: "if only in vain!"="if it do not rather turn to your loss and greater condemnation," in its turn is not in keeping with the reference of παθεῖν to sufferings endured. For although, when sufferings have been endured for the faith, assistance rendered by God in bearing them may make the guilt of a subsequent apostasy greater, the sufferings themselves cannot well be said to increase it. [Notwithstanding the high authorities for this interpretation, which intensifies instead of softening "in vain," it does seem more probable that Paul here leaves "a loophole of doubt." If suffered is the thought implied, then as he recalled their sufferings, would be the very moment for a flash of doubt, or rather of hope, to enter. In this view it is better to render: "If it be really in vain," "I would fain doubt whether it can be, that all this was in vain."—R.]

VER. 5. **He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit.**—With this Paul returns to the decisive question of ver. 2, but with some variation of the thought. He no longer sets the matter back into the past, but represents (no doubt designedly) the communication of the Spirit as something still going on, on the ground of faith. They were to recognize themselves as still experiencing this gracious operation of God. Besides this, he singles out and notes particularly the miraculous powers which God communicates through the same medium. [The word "ministereth" means "to supply bountifully." The ἐπί in the compound indicates the direction of the supply, not an enlargement of it. Δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν may be rendered either, as E. V., "miracles among you," or better, "miraculous powers in you," *i. e.*, the peculiar powers there brought by the Spirit, which Paul everywhere alludes to, as observable in the Christians to whom he writes (1 Cor. xii. 28). MEYER decides for the latter from the analogy of 1 Cor. xii. 6, and it suits better the line of argument, which refers throughout to their personal experience.—R.] Moreover he now designates God expressly as the Bestower of the Spirit, doubtless, in order to bring home with special emphasis the truth that God Himself declared for the preaching of faith. For the Scripture proof which follows supports this idea. God declares for this among the Galatians because He has declared for it in His word, and He must ever agree with Himself, His acts with His testimony.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *A Christian church without a "receiving the Spirit"* is not conceivable. It may lose the Spirit again (comp. σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε), but it must once have received it. Paul, therefore, because he knows that the Galatians have been converted to Christ, assumes of course that they have received the Spirit. The primary reference is undoubtedly to the Holy Ghost only as a charism from God. The immediate reference is not to definite ethical effects on the hearts of recipients, though it is true that these cannot be wanting, if the Spirit received is *retained.* But as the Holy Ghost here is to be apprehended primarily as a charism (comp. ver. 5: ἐπιχορηγῶν), it is quite intelligible that what is given elsewhere as the condition of justification appears here as the condition of "receiving the Spirit," namely: Faith. "Receiving the Spirit" is, it is true, not immediately identical with "being justified," but is nevertheless an inseparable consequence. At all events no receiving of the Spirit" can take place without the "being justified," because the receiving of the Spirit is a token of Divine grace. Hence from the "receiving of the Spirit" "by the hearing of faith" it is concluded that the "being justified" comes by the same method. See also on this point the remarks on the previous section.

2. *The personal experience* of the operation of the preaching of the gospel is rightly (according to the example of Paul) regarded as a principal proof of the truth of the same. The proof lies more particularly in the receiving of the Holy Ghost: if I receive this through the preaching of the gospel, then this must doubtless be true, be the Divinely ordained way to salvation. Thereby does God declare Himself for this preaching; for the Holy Ghost is certainly a gift of GOD. A special application of the "witness of the Holy Ghost" which it might not be amiss to call the strict and original meaning of this doctrine.

3. *All evangelical preaching* should in its essence be nothing else than a portraying of Christ, the Crucified, before the eyes of men. It is by this that it leads them to the receiving of the Spirit.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. "O foolish Galatians."—In STARKE:—It must not be supposed that this is such a phrase of contumely as "Fool," Matt. v. 22, but it is a sorrowful and earnest representation of their spiritual blindness. Christ also addresses His disciples with a similar term of rebuke. Luke xxiv. 25.—Severe reproofs, when they flow from a zeal for the wounded honor of God, and from love to our neighbor, and a desire to save him, are not wrong. The sharp tongue of good men is many times more wholesome than the friendly tongue and flattering words of the ungodly.—As to know Christ aright is the true wisdom, so on the other hand it is the greatest folly not to know Christ aright and not to cleave fast to Him.—[LUTHER:—A carnal man would interpret this to be a reviling, rather than a godly reprehension. Not so. So parents, of a fatherly and motherly affection, do sharply reprove and rebuke their children, which they would not bear if another should do it. Therefore one and the self-same word in the mouth of Paul is a benefit; but in the mouth of another it is a reproach.—R.]

WÜRT. SUMM.:—False doctrine is, as it were, an enchantment, wherewith the devil bewitches men's hearts. For as through sorcery men's minds are blinded, so that they think they see something, when yet they see nothing, and nevertheless it is hard to fetch them off from the notion; even so, when the devil through false doctrine engages the hearts of men, he bewitches them so that they fancy they have the truth before them, when yet it is mere error and lies. Let us therefore the more diligently take heed to ourselves, that we be not taken in and infected with doctrine; let us the more diligently cleave to God's word, and moreover pray heartily with David, Ps. cxix. 18, 37.—[What spell is this that holds so many eyes, before which Jesus Christ has been set forth so plainly as the crucified One, who dies not "without cause!"—R.]

"Jesus Christ evidently set forth before your eyes, crucified."—STARKE:—By this way of speaking is indicated the clearness of the evangelical doctrine of the cross of Christ. In the Old Testament Christ was portrayed to the Jews under many images and types, as in the type of the high priest, of the paschal lamb, *etc.;* but in the New Testament, He was, through the preaching of the gospel, without any shadows such as these, clearly placed before men's eyes, inasmuch as His suffering, shame, satisfaction on the cross, were most clearly published and proclaimed. That was, as it were, the programme which the Apostles *placarded* in all places whither they came.—SPENER:—The best church-paintings are plain instructions concerning Divine truth; thereby can a matter be brought as plainly, and more plainly into the hearts of the hearers, than by the skilfullest painter of them all, yea, those things also which no painter can set forth. Actual paintings in the church are to be by no means utterly rejected, they have their use as memorials; but the other painting of doctrine must be joined therewith, and Christ must be portrayed in the heart, else outward paintings, if men are to learn only by gazing upon them, are a lifeless affair.—[CALVIN:—Paul intimates that the actual sight of Christ's death could not have affected them more powerfully than his preaching. Such a representation could not have been made by any eloquence, or by enticing words of man's wisdom. When the Church has painters such as this, she no longer needs the dead images of wood and stone, she no longer requires pictures. Such things come, when pastors become dumb.—R.]

Ver. 2. "Was it by the works of the law that ye received the Spirit?"—HEDINGER:—A definite, keenly importunate question, with an "either—or," from which there is no escape, appealing to actual experiences, in which no debate is possible,—well fitted to dispel the sorcery (ver. 1) of the false teaching.—A hint as to the right way of convincing and freeing misguided souls out of such enchantment.—Law quickens not, but en-

joins, commands, threatens and terrifies, it is true, yet without life. Bondage, constraint; good appearances enough, hypocrisy enough; carefully contrived clockwork, but mute wheels, without soul. Of such are many, that are praised as Christians. Hourglasses are they, that punctually show the time, but where is there Spirit, Heaven, marks of grace? On that hangs all.—SPENER:—The only means of receiving the Holy Ghost, is the preaching of the gospel, as being a word of the Spirit. Where this is heard, and its energy not resisted, the Holy Ghost comes into the soul, not only to work, but also to dwell therein.—STARKE:—Whatever doctrine the Holy Ghost brings to man, assuring him of Divine grace, and impelling him to all good, that is the true saving doctrine.

Ver. 3. It is not enough to have begun well, the matter must also be carried through. The beginning and the continuing of our salvation must be after one way, and we must not desire to be perfected otherwise than we have begun, else is it folly to us.—SPENER:—That is a doctrine to be abhorred, which to be sure ascribes the beginning of salvation to faith and so to the Spirit, but afterwards feigns that the rest must be accomplished and completed with works.

Ver. 5. STARKE:—It is God alone who gives the Holy Ghost. The Apostles also imparted it through their preaching and imposition of hands, but they were only instruments of God. Now-a-days teachers and preachers impart the Holy Ghost, so far as they preach the Word, which in itself has power, and has the Holy Ghost with it.—It is a truly Divine property of the gospel that God aforetime accompanied it with the most excellent miracles. No one who passed over to Judaism, received from God the power of working miracles, but those did who turned from Judaism to Christianity.—Hast thou, O man, the Holy Ghost and His energy in too small measure? Seek the cause in thyself, in that thou usest not the stated means aright.—SPENER:—Where the Holy Ghost is, there He works, although not always outward miracles, yet in the conversion and renewal of men themselves, which is a greater miracle than to make the sick well.

On vers. 1–5. To portray Jesus Christ before men's eyes as the Crucified is the soul of all preaching of the gospel: 1. This it *must* do, because in the cross of Christ alone salvation is found, and it must do it unweariedly and explicitly, with all earnestness, all fidelity, and all zeal. 2. But more it *cannot* do; the inscribing on the heart it must leave to God; although indeed it must ever admonish of the necessity of this, and exhort men to prove whether this has taken place (must warn against dead faith).—Jesus Christ has been portrayed before your eyes as the Crucified; is He also portrayed in your hearts?—Whoever seeks his salvation elsewhere than in Christ, the Crucified, 1) lacks understanding, for he leaves the living spring, which God Himself has opened for us, and hews out for himself broken cisterns; 2) is entangled in an enchantment, bewitched by the deceiving spirit of self-righteousness.—Who hath bewitched you? A question which must be sounded forth in many a congregation; for 1) Christ, the Crucified, is portrayed before their eyes, and yet 2) there is such an utter neglect to seek salvation in Him.—How is the Holy Ghost obtained? 1. Not from works of the law, this follows from the nature of the law, but 2. through faith in the gospel—simply because it is the good news of Christ, the Crucified.

Faith in Jesus Christ the true way to salvation; for through it alone is the Holy Spirit received, not through the works of the law.—How have you received the Spirit? A question to strengthen and warn those who are in danger of embracing the righteousness of works.—Faith in Christ Jesus, 1) it is true in itself, not yet a proof that a man has received the Spirit, for there is also a dead faith; 2) but yet the only way to receive Him.—The preaching of faith the way to the receiving of the Spirit. Therewith is condemned all fanaticism with which, indeed, a righteousness of works of some kind or other is commonly joined.—It is God who bestows the Spirit, but only through the preaching of faith.—The Holy Ghost is the true heavenly gift.—Where God gives the Spirit, He also gives power (Spirit and power always conjoined).—To begin in the Spirit, to end in the flesh, is the most preposterous folly, and yet how frequent.—Hast thou begun in the Spirit? Continue in like manner, and end in the Spirit!

[Christ only, Christ plainly, Christ crucified! the Gospel we preach.—That which is "so foolish" is yet so natural.—Take heed that what God blessed to your spiritual profit, be not despised by you. What means He has honored with His Spirit, do not dishonor by your treatment of them.—Is it indeed in vain? All past sufferings for the Gospel's sake? Aye, and worse than in vain. These have no power to save. Christ's sufferings alone can save.—Our works do not earn God's works.—The Gospel, "the hearing of faith," still has the "witness of the Spirit," is still the δύναμις of God, by which He works δυνάμεις.—R.]

B. Doctrinal Exposition

Chapter III. 6—IV. 7.

1. Salvation is not to be attained by works of the law, but through faith alone.

(Chap. iii. 6–18).

a. Demonstration from Scripture.

(Vers. 6–14.)

6 Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.
7 Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children [sons] of
8 Abraham. And [Moreover] the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify [or justifieth][1] the heathen [Gentiles] through faith, preached before the gospel [proclaimed beforehand the glad tidings][2] unto Abraham, *saying*, In thee shall all nations be
9 blessed.[3] So then they which be [who are] of faith are blessed with [together with
10 the][4] faithful Abraham. For as many as are of the works of the law are under the [or a] curse: for it is written,[5] Cursed *is* every one that continueth not in all things
11 which are written in the book of the law to do them. But that no man is justified by the law [in the law no man is justified][6] in the sight of God, *it is* evident: for,
12 The just shall live by faith. And [Now][7] the law is not of faith: but, The man
13 [He][8] that doeth [or has done] them shall live in them. Christ hath [omit hath][9] redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made [having become][10] a curse for
14 us; for [as][11] it is written, Cursed *is* every one that hangeth on a tree: That the blessing of Abraham might come on [unto][12] the Gentiles through [ἐν, in] Jesus Christ [Christ Jesus];[13] that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

[1] Ver. 8.—[Δικαιοῖ, present—Ellicott calls it the "ethical present." "God justifieth," this is His one way (Alford).—R.]

[2] Ver. 8.—[Since "gospel" has a distinct meaning now, it is perhaps better to take the more etymological phrase in rendering προευηγγελίσατο. Schmoller: "*Gab die Verheissung.*"—R.]

[3] Ver. 8.—Elz. has εὐλογηθήσονται instead of ἐνευλογηθήσονται against decisive authorities.

[4] Ver. 9.—["Together with" is more distinct than "with." The article of the Greek is retained to emphasize "faithful."—R.]

[5] Ver. 10.—According to the best MSS. ὅτι should be inserted before ἐπικατάρατος. [The generally received reading does not affect the English form, since ὅτι is here a mere quotation mark.—R.]

[6] Ver. 11.—[Since ἐν νόμῳ must be rendered "in the law;" to avoid the too close proximity with "in the sight of," it is better to retain the Greek order, which is emphatic also.—R.]

[7] Ver. 12.—[Δέ "logical, introducing the minor proposition" (Alford). "Now" is perhaps better than "but."—R.]

[8] Ver. 12.—After αὐτά, Elz. reads ἄνθρωπος against decisive authorities.

[9] Ver. 13.—[The aorist ἐξηγόρασεν is historical, hence the simple past is better.—In ver. 12, ποιήσας, aorist participle, should be rendered "hath done" to bring out its proper force.—R.]

[10] Ver. 13.—[Γενόμενος, "becoming," but as it explains the manner of the past act "redeemed," "having become" is more accurate. "By becoming" would be still more forcible.—R.]

[11] Ver. 13.—Lachmann and Tischendorf, following weighty authorities, read: ὅτι γέγραπται instead of γέγραπται γάρ. [So Meyer and modern English editors. ℵ. has γέγ. γάρ.—R.]

[12] Ver. 14.—[Εἰς, "unto." The clause were perhaps better read in this order: "That unto the Gentiles the blessing of Abraham might come in Christ Jesus" (so Ellicott).—R.]

[13] Ver. 14.—[Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is the reading of most MSS. (ℵ. B. Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ), and is adopted by most modern editors.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 6. **Even as Abraham believed God.**—This stands in immediate connection with the preceding, and gives the answer to the question in ver. 5, by an affirmation of the second part of it (for Paul views the gift of the Spirit previously mentioned as a proof of justification, and can therefore answer the question in ver. 5 with the statement in ver. 6). Through the preaching of faith God bestows the Spirit of faith, and thereby justifies, even as Abraham attained to justification in the same way. But inasmuch as Paul in going on still keeps Abraham in view, we may, and ought to begin here a new section. This verse does not contain a citation proper, but Paul gives what is contained in Gen. xv. 6 respecting Abraham, as his own immediate declaration. (Comp. Rom. iv. 3.) That **accounted to him**

for righteousness is understood by Paul entirely in the sense of "being justified" needs no demonstration.*

Ver. 7. Here, in the first place, he only draws from it the conclusion, that a man by faith becomes a son of Abraham. (Οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, "the spiritual character represented under the form of the causal relation," those that are born of faith, have as it were their nature from it. EWALD explains it somewhat differently: those whose efforts and achievements proceed from faith, as the deepest, and at the same time highest power.) This conclusion of course rests on the presupposition that faith was an essential trait in Abraham's character, and is directed against the Judaizers, who believe that they can prove themselves genuine children of Abraham by works of the law. [The older commentators took γινώσκετε as indicative; "ye know then;" modern ones generally consider it an imperative: **Know ye therefore.**—So MEYER, DE WETTE, ELLICOTT, WORDSWORTH, also Syriac, Vulgate. ELLICOTT: "The imperative is not only more animated, but more logically correct, for the declaration in the verse is really one of the points which the Apostle is laboring to prove." He contends that ἄρα is most properly joined with the imperative. ALFORD and LIGHTFOOT adopt the other view, the latter suggesting that the verb means "to perceive" rather than "to know," which makes the indicative more suitable. There is not necessarily any "argumentative irony" (ALFORD) here. On the whole the imperative seems preferable.—R.]

Paul has made reference to Abraham as the type of justifying faith; he does not, however, content himself with that, but, going deeper, he finds still more striking proof in the significance of Abraham as the bringer of blessing for all the heathen. He dwells the longer on the Old Testament because it was to this that the false teachers naturally appealed against Paul, and by their appeals to it imposed on the Galatians. So he on the other hand seeks to establish his doctrine from the Old Testament, simply by going more deeply into it. [LIGHTFOOT: "The passage vers. 6–9 was omitted in Marcion's recension of the Epistle, as repugnant to his leading principle of the antagonism between the Old and New Testaments."—R.]

Ver. 8. **Moreover the Scripture foreseeing.**—Δέ is simply continuative. [Neither "and" nor "but" gives the precise force.—R.] What God has promised is ascribed to the Scripture itself, not simply because it is related in the Scripture, but because the Scripture, as inspired by God, is conceived as the organ of the Spirit of God. The same then is true of God's foreknowledge, from which the promise proceeded. Yet Paul has not gained from some other source a knowledge of the fact that the Scripture foresaw, and in this foresight gave the promise (WIESELER), but he draws the conclusion as to the "foreseeing" simply from the promise itself: because it is promised, that "all nations shall be blessed in Abraham," the "justifying of the Gentiles through faith" must also have been predetermined. Why, he then explains in what follows.—[ELLICOTT calls δικαιοῖ an *ethical present*, with significant reference to the eternal and immutable counsels of God. ALFORD: "Present, not merely because the time foreseen was regarded as present, not present as respected the time of writing, but because it was God's *one* way of justification—He never justified in any other way—so that it is the normal present: 'He is a God that justifieth' through faith."—R.] Paul cites as proof Gen. xii. 1–3; xviii. 18. The chief emphasis lies upon "shall be blessed," which is therefore placed first in the Greek; yet only so far as it is a "being blessed in Abraham." The sense is: The blessing bestowed upon thee includes a blessing hereafter to come upon all the Gentiles (ἔθνη here of course in the pregnant sense=Gentiles). From this the conclusion is drawn in

Ver. 9. **So then they which be of faith.**—"So then"= agreeably to the promise in ver. 8. Ver. 9 is nothing else than an exposition of the promise cited in ver. 8. In Abraham, it was promised, all the heathen are to be blessed, a promise which has the sense indicated above. Now, he was the *believing one*, and it was (as follows from ver. 6) on account of his faith that he received the promise of blessing. *Therefore* it is, of course, *believers* that are partakers of the blessing promised to him, it is they who are his children, and it is to them therefore that the promise of blessing holds good.—**Are blessed with [together with the] faithful Abraham.**—In this sentence the ἐν is dropped, for the sense is: because the "being blessed in him," is promised to all the heathen, therefore "they which be of faith" (the heathen, if they are "of faith") are blessed *with* him, that is, primarily, in like manner as he; but still further: it expresses the sameness of the lot into which they entered with him, and through this one lot they entered into inner communion with him.—[The preposition shows their community with him in the blessing; the adjective "faithful" renders prominent that point of ethical character in which they must resemble each other, in order to partake of the same blessing. (So MEYER, ALFORD.) —R.] "Are blessed."—As to the meaning of this, there is little occasion for dispute. If we look at the original passage, this is, of course, to be understood quite generally, as is implied in the idea of Blessing = Manifestation of Divine Favor. This again is more specially defined in different ways, and so here; so far as concerns the blessing received by Abraham himself: "together with the faithful Abraham," the primary meaning is that he should obtain a posterity, and as concerns the blessing of the Gentiles in Abraham, the passage is justly regarded as a

* [CALVIN thus refers to "the idle cavillings of certain persons who evade Paul's reasoning. Moses, they tell us, gives the name of righteousness to goodness; and so means nothing more than that Abraham was reckoned a good man because he believed God. Giddy minds of this description, raised up in our time by Satan, endeavor, by indirect slanders, to undermine the certainty of Scripture. Paul knew that Moses was not there giving lessons to boys in grammar, but was speaking of a decision which God had pronounced, and very properly viewed the word *righteousness* in a theological sense. For it is not in that sense in which goodness is mentioned with approbation among men, that we are accounted righteous in the sight of God, but only where we render perfect obedience to the law. Righteousness is contrasted with the transgression of the law, even in its smallest point; and because we have it not of ourselves, it is freely given to us by God."—R.]

Messianic promise in the wider sense=the Gentiles shall have part in the salvation brought by the Messiah, in the salvation that proceeds from one who is Abraham's offspring. The latter is the sense here. *Which* side of this Messianic salvation, however, Paul has in mind, is to be made out solely from the connection, most simply from what is put in opposition to it, namely, to be "under the curse," and, to that again, the simple antithesis is "justified" (ver. 11). Paul of course views "blessed" and "justified" as essentially correlative, coincident ideas: and hence in ver. 8 the one, namely, "justified," is inferred from the other, "blessed." Only, as is easily understood, "blessed" still remains the more general idea; what kind of blessing is meant must be shown by the context. Somewhat more restricted, again, than "justification," is "receiving the Spirit," which, however, is not only connected with the "justification," but is really the true "blessing," on which account Paul, starting from "receiving the Spirit" in the beginning of this chapter, returns to it again in ver. 14.—The ground of the promise in ver. 8, and also of the statement expository of it in ver. 9, is given in ver. 10. A blessing to be bestowed upon the Gentiles in Abraham, and therefore one resting upon faith, is promised; such a one is, and only such a one *can* be, contemplated.

Ver. 10. **For as many as are of the works of the law, are under a curse.**—The force of this is: it must be those "of faith" who are blessed; for those who busy themselves with "works of the law" (the only alternative possible, if not "of faith") cannot be blessed; since these are under the curse, and therefore a bestowal of blessing cannot avail for them. [This negative argument (vers. 10, 12,) strengthens the position taken in the preceding verses, and has an immediate application to the Galatian errors, to which however no allusion is made in this strictly argumentative passage.—R.] "Of the works of the law;" the form is the same as in the antithetical expression, "of faith," but more fully stated.—**Cursed is every one**, *etc.*—Deut. xvii. 26, freely quoted from the LXX. The passage proves what it is cited to prove, viz., that "as many as are of the law are under the curse," provided a non-continuance can be established. This shows that the reference here is to ethical requirements, and not merely to ritualistic ones; thus confirming the view of "works of the law," given in chap. ii. At the same time the passage shows that the ground of "a man is not justified by the works of the law," is that those who "are of the works of the law are under the curse;" the non-justification has then of course its ground, not in the externality of the law, for that would not of necessity involve a curse, but in our not keeping it.

Ver. 11. **But that in the law no man is justified**, *etc.*—Those who are of the works of the law are under the curse. This includes not being justified, but only *implicite.* Paul now states it expressly, in order to support it by declarations of Scripture, as he previously did the positive side. The course of thought might, perhaps, be still more accurately defined as follows: Cursed, it has been declared, is every one that continueth not in all things; but, on the other hand, it might be said, such as entirely fulfil the law will be blest. But, remarks Paul, that is excluded by the tenor of the two Scripture passages about to be cited, for according to them man *ζήσεται ἐκ πίστεως*, but the law is in no wise *ἐκ πίστεως*, therefore no one is justified *ἐν νόμῳ*; the thought that "in the law" justification is possible, is to be entirely put aside.—**In the sight of God.**—*Παρὰ θεῷ* defines more particularly the idea of "justified," and sets it in antithesis to any (justifying) human judgment. The proof that "in the law no man is justified," Paul derives from two Scripture passages. According to the one (Hab. ii. 4) "to live," results from "faith," according to the other (Lev. xviii. 5) the law does not take note of faith, but of doing; through doing, fulfilling the law, a man has life.—This, of course, has demonstrative force, for "no man is justified" only on the presupposition that this doing (in the second passage) remains only a requirement, and does not actually take place, and that it is with the knowledge of this state of things that the prophet represents faith as the condition of life.—**The just shall live by faith.**—אֱמוּנָה in the original has, rightly explained, not the signification "faithfulness," but as Paul translates it, "Trust, Faith." [The first is undoubtedly the primary meaning of the Hebrew word, but the other is implied in it. It is noteworthy that this passage is one of the two in the Old Testament, where the word "faith" is used in the E. V. See a very suggestive note in LIGHTFOOT, p. 152.—R.]—יִחְיֶה he then naturally understands, agreeably to the New Testament knowledge of salvation, in the higher sense of the Messianic life, that which renders its consummation in eternal life. Ἐκ πίστεως must be joined as in the original with *ζήσεται*, and not with *ὁ δίκαιος*. WIESELER justly remarks: In proof of the connection *ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως*, it is alleged that the origin of justification was to be shown, not that of salvation or life. It must not be forgotten, however, that according to the connection the emphasis does not rest upon *δικαιοῦσθαι* in itself, but upon the fact that this results *ἐκ πίστεως*; moreover that Paul is not here using his own words, in which case instead of *ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται* he would undoubtedly have chosen another term of expression, such as *ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῦσθαι*, but that he had to choose from the actually existing passages which treated of the central significance of faith. Whoever examines these more particularly will not be able to deny that the choice made is a happy one. For what does *ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται* signify, but that Faith is the fundamental condition through which a man becomes well-pleasing to God, and partaker of the gracious gift of life? In this formula, therefore, the *δικαιοῦσθαι ἐκ πίστεως*, or the statement that one is declared righteous or well-pleasing to God, in consequence of faith, is in truth included. Δίκαιος, on the other hand, signifies the righteous or devout man, and has here nothing more than an etymological connection with *δικαιοῦσθαι*. That *ἐκ πίστεως* is joined by Paul in the Galatians with *ζήσεται*, appears, moreover, from its antithesis, *ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς*: "he will live through the commandments." [It is difficult to decide this question of connection; either would be grammatical, both are sustained

by high authorities. WINER, DE WETTE, EWALD, ELLICOTT agree with WIESELER; while BENGEL, PAREUS, MEYER, ALFORD, and very many others connect "by faith" with "the just." The former conforms better with the Hebrew; the latter with the general course of Paul's thoughts here and elsewhere. The former is safer, the latter more pointed, but from either the same truth would be deduced.—R.]

Ver. 12. **Now the law is not of faith.**—[Δέ, logical, introducing the minor proposition: "The just shall live by faith." "Now the law is not of faith" (so MEYER).—R.] "The law is not an institution whose nature is determined by faith." WIESELER. [LIGHTFOOT: 'Faith is not the starting-point of the law. The law does not take faith as its fundamental principle. On the other hand, it rigidly enforces the performance of all its enactments.'—**Has done them.**—Actual and entire performance of all requirements. Doing, not believing.—R.]

Ver. 13. **Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law.**—"The asyndeton makes the contrast more energetic."—MEYER. ["Redeemed." WORDSWORTH: "The aorist is important to be observed, as intimating that the Redemption was effected by *one act*, *i. e.*, by the shedding of His blood, paid as the price of our ransom, when He became a curse for us by dying on the *cross*."—R.] That Paul here proceeds to speak of the redemption from the curse, and therefore presupposes the latter as existing, is of easy explanation. In ver. 10 it had been declared that "as many as of the works of the law are under a curse;" and, on the other hand, it needed no demonstration that all those who had the "law," and as yet nothing else, that is, the Jews, are "of the works of the law" and therefore "are under a curse." "Us," therefore, naturally refers primarily to the Jews, for these, who alone had the "law," alone stood under the "curse of the law." Comp. also, particularly, chap. iv. 5: "to redeem them that were under the law." WIESELER also justly remarks, that particularly in the doctrinal exposition in the Galatians, Paul loves, from easily intelligible reasons, to include himself with the Jewish people, in the first person. Yet I would not be disposed wholly to reject the more general sense of ἡμᾶς. It is true, it was primarily only the Jews who stood under the curse of the law; but Paul here may be thinking not only of the actual, but also of the ideal or possible being under it; that is, through Christ the true way to justification by faith in Him is opened to all. it could not therefore be any longer demanded of the Gentiles (and they could not be tempted) to concern themselves with "the works of the law," through which they also would have come under the curse of the law. Ἔθνη, ver. 14, need not be taken as the direct antithesis of this; doubtless it has the emphasis, and on this account stands first, but the ἔθνη may have been made particularly prominent, only because the fulfilment of the promise given in relation to *them* has become possible through the atoning death of Christ, and in the blessing of the *Gentiles* the reality and effect of the death of Christ is chiefly manifest. But that the effect of this extends of course to the Jews, also is added in the clause introduced by ἵνα. In this clause at least MEYER, WIESELER, and others, understand the first person plural generally, of Jews and Gentiles. MEYER, limiting ἡμᾶς, ver. 13, to the Jews, understands the somewhat difficult connection of vers. 13 and 14 peculiarly, almost too artificially: as long as the curse of the law stood in force, and the Jews therefore were unredeemed, the Gentiles could not become partakers of that blessing; for it was involved in the preëminence which, according to the Divine plan of redemption was bestowed on the Jews, that salvation should proceed from them to the Gentiles. When therefore Christ through His atoning death freed *the Jews* from the curse of their law, God must necessarily have had the design therewith, of imparting to *the Gentiles* the promised justification, and that not in any such way as through the law, but in Christ Jesus, through whom already redemption from the curse of the law had been effected for the Jews. More simple, and more congruous also with the interpretation of ἡμᾶς in the general sense, is USTERI's explanation: Christ has, by His vicarious death, redeemed us from the curse of the law, in order that (if now henceforth justification is attained through faith) the Gentiles may become partakers of the blessing of Abraham, as from now henceforth there is required for justification a condition possible for all, namely, Faith. The simplest and best exposition of "redeemed from the curse of the law" is MEYER's: "The law is personified as a potentate, who had subjected those dependent upon him to his curse; but from this constraint of the curse, out of which they would not else have come, has Christ redeemed them, and that by His having procured for them, through His *mors satisfactoria*, the forgiveness of sins (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; Rom. iii. 24 *et al.*), so that now the curse of the law had no more relation to them (objectively—to which must then be added—and nothing else can be added—'faith,' in order that this redemption may also be subjectively realized.)

Having become a curse for us.—The *mode* of the redemption is here expressed, namely, by His crucifixion, in which he was set forth as burdened with the Divine ὀργή. The *emphasis* therefore rests on the word κατάρα, which on this account is attracted to the end, and the use of which is immediately to be justified by a declaration of Scripture. The abstract instead of the concrete is chosen, in order to represent with more of vigorous precision the adequacy of the satisfaction which Christ has rendered (comp. the previous ἐκ κατάρας), and it stands *without the article*, because the thought is not, that Christ suffered the *definite*, just named curse of the *law*, to which the subjects of the law are exposed, but in a general sense, that He became an accursed one; it is meant to express not *what* curse he became, but *that* He became a curse (the *that* moreover appears from the following Scripture passage).—Ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν: "ὑπέρ in all places where the discourse is of the atoning death not=instead of, but=in behalf of. The satisfaction, which Christ rendered, was rendered in our behalf; that it was vicarious is implied in the nature of the act itself, not in the preposition. The curse of the law would have had to be realized in that all who did not completely satisfy the law (and this no one could), would have been compelled to endure

the execution of the Divine ὀργή against them; but for their deliverance from this sentence Christ with His death has intervened, inasmuch as He died as *Accursed*, whereby, as through a ransom, that damnatory relation of the law was dissolved." See the DOCTRINAL NOTES below.

As it is written, Cursed is every one, *etc.*—Scriptural justification of the declaration just made respecting Christ, "having become a curse:" from Deut. xxi. 23, cited freely from the LXX. "The original passage has reference to persons stoned, and then far greater ignominy, publicly hung up on a (probably cruciform) stake, who, however, must not be left to hang over night, because such accursed ones would else have defiled the holy land. Deut. xxi. 23; Num. xxv. 4: Joshua x. 26, 27; 2 Sam. iv. 12. And in that Christ also when executed hung upon a stake, the epithet ἐπικατάρατος applies also to Him." MEYER. [WORDSWORTH notes a remarkable conformity of the prophetical reference to Christ in the passage here cited. The body must be taken down, but "if He had been crucified on some ordinary day, not on the day before that High Day, the Jews would have been as eager that He should remain on the cross as they were then earnest that He should be taken down. Thus, in crucifying Him, and taking Him down from the cross, they proved unconsciously that He whom they crucified is the Messiah, and that it was He who. bearing the curse of the law, has taken away that curse from all who believe."—R.] "Therefore, even if in the original passage crucifixion proper is not meant (which was not an ancient Israelitish punishment), yet that which particularly made both kinds of punishment a curse, the hanging and exposure on the wood was common to them. Ξύλον, used of the wood of the cross, undoubtedly on account of the עֵץ of the Old Testament passage, is found also Acts v. 30; x. 39; xiii. 29; 1 Pet. ii. 24." WIESELER. [ELLICOTT: "It is interesting to notice that the dead body was not hanged by the neck, but *by the hands*, and not on a tree, but on a piece of wood.'—R.]

Ver. 14. **That unto the Gentiles might come.**—Respecting the connection see above on ver. 13.—**The blessing of Abraham** = the blessing before announced to Abraham.—**In Christ Jesus.**—"In Christ (in His expiatory death) the bestowal of the blessing has its ground. The following διὰ τῆς πίστεως expresses the matter from the point of view of the subjective medium, while ἐν Χριστῷ sets forth the objective fact." MEYER.—**That we might receive the promise of the Spirit.**—"Climatically parallel to the first clause of intention." MEYER. The first person, "that we might receive," applies undoubtedly to Christians generally, Jews or Gentiles.—"Receive the promise of the Spirit"=to receive the promised Spirit. [ELLICOTT: "Not merely the promised Spirit, but the realization of the promise of the Spirit." This is to be preferred.—R.] Is this to be taken as a nearer definition of the "blessing of Abraham?" It is not immediately identical with this as (see on ver. 9) the "blessing" (in itself quite general) in the connection means primarily the "justification." However not only does the receiving of the Spirit stand in immediate connection, both of thought and fact, with the justification, but although in "the promise of the Spirit," the primary reference is to such a promise as that in Joel iii. [E. V.], yet this again stands, at least in the history of salvation, in connection with the promise given to Abraham in reference to the heathen, so that the two promises are combined on satisfactory grounds in this relation also. In any case Paul is looking back to the beginning of ver. 2. [LIGHTFOOT: 'The law, the greater barrier which excluded the Gentiles, is done away in Christ. By its removal the Gentiles are put on a level with the Jews; and thus united, they both gain access through the Spirit to the Father.' Comp. Eph. ii. 14–18. ELLICOTT: "After a wondrous chain of arguments, expressed with equal force, brevity and profundity, the Apostle comes back to the subject of ver. 2; the gift of the Holy Ghost came through faith in Jesus Christ."—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Abraham's justification on the ground of his faith* (or rather the direct declaration of the Scripture respecting it), is adduced by Paul as an argument for Justification on the ground of Faith here, and particularly, as is known, in Romans iv. also. The faith in Christ must therefore be regarded by Paul as one in kind with that of Abraham. But it by no means follows from this, as WIESELER justly remarks, that Abraham himself already believed on the Messiah. "For in the Old Testament history of Abraham the idea of the Messiah is nowhere mentioned, often as there was occasion for it, but only the idea of a salvation and blessing coming from Abraham to all nations, the first traces of a universal kingdom of God, to which however the Divine Head is yet lacking. In the New Testament also the idea of the Messiah is nowhere attributed to Abraham. The passage John viii. 5, 6, hardly signifies any thing else than that Abraham, in the theophanies, *etc.*, experienced by him, already beheld the preëxisting Christ." Yet Paul, with entire justice, places the Christian faith in parallelism with that of Abraham; for the one, as well as the other, was essentially a trustful laying hold of a promise coming from Divine grace, as to which, moreover, WIESELER points out that with Abraham, the promised heir of his body came into view at the same time as the future bearer of the collective blessing promised to Abraham, and faith on the promise respecting Him was therefore faith also on the kingdom of God originating in his posterity. It by no means follows from this, that then the *matter* [*Inhalt*] of the Christian and of the Abrahamic faith would be a different one, and that faith would justify on account of its subjective character, while yet it justifies only on account of its matter and object. In the promise given by Divine grace, the faith of the Christian, as of Abraham, has its common matter. For such a promise the Christian lays hold of in faith on Christ, as much as Abraham did in his faith. The real ground of justification in both cases is therefore the grace of God, which gives man something that he could not of himself attain to, and on natural conditions could not even expect, and faith is, as that which nevertheless confi-

dently lays hold of this grace, only the *conditio sine qua non.*—It is very true, this grace of God itself has a different matter with Christians and with Abraham; with Christians its matter is essentially the reconciliation accomplished in Christ, and the forgiveness of sin implied therein, with Abraham it is what has just been mentioned—a distinction which is conditioned simply by the course of the economy of salvation, and which does not prejudice Paul's parallelizing of the two; for Paul speaks here—comp. v. 7, 8, 9—quite generally of *πίστις*, has in view, therefore what constitutes its generic nature.—Agreeably to this the definite matter of the *δικαιοῦσθαι* in the two cases is different, *i. e.*, the generic unity is the becoming acceptable to God and accordingly being blessed by Him, and this community of character fully justifies this parallelizing also. But with Christians this general idea is still further defined as follows: to be delivered from the divine wrath incurred by their sins, and to become partakers of the forgiveness of sins. A distinction, to this extent at least, between the *δικαιοῦσθαι* of Abraham and that of Christians, must be conceded even by those who assume the Messiah to have been the object of faith in the case of Abraham also. For even on this assumption, it will not be alleged that "accounted to him for righteousness" in the case of Abraham has exactly the sense: his sins were forgiven him. This is not treated of in any way in this passage.—That this appeal to Abraham's faith is in no respect an arbitrary laying hold of a single chance passage, that accords with the line of argument, is clear. For, allowing that this judgment respecting the faith of Abraham is found only here, yet confessedly faith in God's gracious promise was that which specifically characterized Abraham, was precisely that which made him the child of God, nay, the Friend of God, and so of course acceptable to God. This would be irrefragably established by the history of his life, even if we had not this direct declaration, Gen. xv. 6.—With perfect justice therefore Paul can designate those who are "of faith" as Abraham's sons. A strong, crushing expression against the Jewish national pride, corresponding to the words of John the Baptist, Matt. iii. 9, and of Jesus Himself, John viii. 39—and yet not in conflict with the truth that according to the Divine purpose the Jewish nation as such, agreeably to its natural descent from Abraham, was the chosen nation. For this people itself, as a whole, was meant to be of the faith of its ancestor, in order to be a true people of God; and the Divine judgment made, we know, a perpetual distinction among the mass of the people between such as were "of faithful Abraham" = were his legitimate [*i. e.*, spiritually legitimate.—R.] children, and such as were not.*

2. *The Scripture is the exposition of a Divine plan of salvation*, connected and of uniform tenor throughout, which has had its definite historical unfolding. In it therefore the earlier has respect to the later, the first to the last; a word of God, belonging to the beginning, is already shaped in view of the consummation; to this is added, that the God who beholds at once the beginning and the end, ideally anticipates with direct words of promise the future development of His counsel of salvation.—To recognize even in the germ the development, requires, doubtless, an apprehension intimately conversant with Scriptural truth, an eye illumined by the Spirit.

3. *The curse of the law.* As the blessing comes from God, as a revelation of His favor and grace (in gifts), so also the curse, as a revelation of His wrath (in judgments, which concentrate themselves in the *κατάκριμα* of death). In that this revelation of wrath is a consequence of the nonfulfilment of the *law*, the curse is called "the curse of the law," ver. 13 (under which therefore, in the first place, only the Jews stood, as being alone those who hold to the law, but under which of course all would come, who are "of the works of the law"). More precisely: a man comes under this "curse," is under bonds to it, and held prisoner by it, if he is "of the works of the law" (ver. 10), that is, performs indeed *single* works, but nothing more, and yet believes himself thereby to have satisfied the law, which is in no wise the case (see above on "works of the law" in the preceding section).

4. *Christ a curse for us.* To avert this curse of God and to bring His blessing upon all men, Christ has become "a curse for us." Here we stand in presence of the deepest mystery of atonement; we may not, in order to make it more comprehensible, weaken the fact, but must take the words even here, as they say and sound, without artifices of interpretation. Since Christ has freed us from our curse, by having become a curse for us, then, if our redemption from the curse is not to be an illusion, but something real, He became also really *the bearer of the Divine curse*, He has borne the Divine *ὀργή* passively, has felt it, and also actively has sustained it. And this has come to pass by His death on the cross. Only we must of course not suffer the monstrous thought to arise that God was angry with Him, something that *could not* be; nay more, it was in His death on the cross that He was above all an *ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας*, "odor of sweetness," unto God. Nevertheless He has, in the first place, *undergone* the Divine wrath by suffering death, whereby there was accomplished on Him the *κατάκριμα*, "condemnation," of death, and so the curse upon sin; the mode of death, moreover, exhibiting this death, even in form, as a death under curse. Yet that is not all, He has, in the second place, also felt the wrath of God, in that the enjoyment, the sense of the blessed communion of love with God vanished from Him without the reality of this communion itself thereby ceasing. He was, it is true, an *ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας* to God, but the sense of it vanished from Him, although perhaps only momentarily in those instants of anguish when He uttered the complaint upon the cross that God had forsaken Him. But what was lacking in duration, so to speak, was most completely, as it were, compensated by the fearful intensity of such a sense of abandonment by God, in the soul of the beloved Son of God. To this extent He has fully become a curse, has

* [STANLEY (*History of the Jewish Church.* Vol. I., Sect. 1,) gives a more poetic view of Abraham's faith. Fascinating as these lectures are, it is easier to see whither they tend as one studies this argument of Paul. The stress which this brilliant author puts upon "obeyed" in this very connection, may sound like the voice of a broader Christianity, but tested by Paul's argument here, it proves to be the echo of a narrowing Judaism: "of the law." LIGHTFOOT'S note, p. 156, is much more satisfactory.—R.]

felt the wrath of God, even as condemning wrath. But if it is objected, "but not as eternally condemning," we must again refer to that intensity of the sense of wrath as an adequate expiation.—He has thus become a curse for us = in our behalf; but in our behalf only inasmuch as He thereby came *in our place*. The vicariousness does not lie in the expression ὑπέρ, but in the fact; if we, by the very fact that He became "a curse," have been made free from the "curse," in that there is of course involved that He came in our place; an exchange of positions occurred.—For it is stated that the effect of Christ's "becoming a curse" is to "redeem us from the curse of the law," and so at all events an entire acquittal therefrom, and averting of it. Christ is here represented as showing Himself (immediately, yes alone) *active* in the work of redemption; He offered Himself, is the sense, in becoming a curse, and therewith He presented a ransom—to whom? to "the curse of the law" which had dominion over us. The ransom consisted in Himself; He devoted Himself in this very "becoming a curse" to the power of this potentate, and thus in return let us go free. Analyzing the conception thus, we see that it is a figurative one; in order to reduce it to its exact expression, we must take in the idea (which Paul does not here introduce in so many words) of the sin-offering. In becoming a curse Christ became a sin-offering, and this, because it was an unblemished one, and for this reason an ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας, was accepted by God; and in return Christ, as it were, discharged us from the curse of the law which He represented, took it from us. (Inasmuch as Christ Himself brought this sin-offering in free obedience, He is with justice described as the one active in it, as here; the action of God Himself being of course understood.)—This is only the negative side, the positive is then added ver. 14, where the positive (and moreover subjective) effects of the redemption "from the curse of the law" are named; generically, the being blessed, specially, the receiving of the Spirit. Upon this, especially upon the relation of it to justification, see above in the Exeg. Notes. We add only the observation: in the Apostle's apprehension of the history of salvation, the operation of the death of Christ is taken out of its isolation; we recognize in it only the fulfilment of the promise given in the beginning of the redemptive revelation; in Christ it is nothing else than the blessing of Abraham that comes to fulfilment; Beginning and End are united. (See upon this the next Sections.)

5. [*The two curses.* Wordsworth thus sums up the doctrinal points implied: "Two curses pronounced in the law are here referred to by St. Paul. All mankind was liable to the former one. How was it to be removed?

(1) He who was to *remove* it must not himself be *liable* to it. He who was to be a substitute for the *guilty* must himself be *innocent* He who was to suffer in the stead of the *disobedient* must himself be *obedient* in all things.

(2) He who was to be the substitute for *all* must have the *common nature* of *all*. He must not take the person of one individual man (such as Abraham, Moses, Elias), but He must take the *nature* of all, and sum *up all mankind* in himself.

(3) He who was to do more than counterbalance the weight of the *sins* of *all* must have infinite merits of *His own*, in order that the scale of Divine Justice may preponderate in their favor. And nothing that is not divine is infinite. In order, therefore, that He may be able to suffer for sin, he must be *human;* and in order that He may be able to take away the sins, and to *satisfy* God's Justice for them, He must be *Divine*.

(4) In order that He may remove the *curse* pronounced in the law of God for disobedience, He must undergo that *punishment* which is specially declared in the Law to *be* the *curse* of God.

(5) That punishment is hanging on a tree. That is specially called in the Law the curse of God. Deut. xxi. 23.

By undergoing this curse for us, Christ, He who is God from everlasting, and who became *Emmanuel*, God with us, God in our flesh, uniting together the two natures—the Divine and the Human—in His One Person—Christ Jesus, redeemed us from the curse of the Law. Thus, having accepted the curse, He liberated us from it."—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 6. Rieger:—This reckoning somewhat for righteousness rests most of all on God's taking pleasure in faith, and on the fulfilling of His promises, those to which faith trusts. True, even faith gives God the honor, and is in this respect greater than any work. But even faith cannot always give to God the honor so willingly, so fully, with such victory over all doubts arising from the reason, as it should. Therefore God's *imputation* is still the best, according to which good pleasure of His will He counts even a weak spark of faith for righteousness, and therefore I may be assured that, though I now and then be somewhat doubtful of His gracious will, which He has towards me, mistrust Him, become in spirit sad and heavy, I am yet surrounded and overspread with the broad heaven of His promises, and especially of His forgiving grace, and even then His gracious imputation remains valid.

Ver. 7. Heubner:—Abraham's spiritual children are only those like-minded with him, *i. e.*, believing souls. By faith thou becomest like the old patriarchs; they acknowledge thee for worthy offspring, whether thou be derived from the same nation, according to the flesh, as they, or not. Spiritual genealogy and probate is of another sort from civil.

[Calvin:—Paul has omitted one remark, which will be readily supplied, that there is no place in the Church for any man who is not a son of Abraham.—Hooker:—The invisible Church consisteth only of true Israelites, true sons of Abraham, true servants and saints of God.—R.]

Rieger:—The footsteps of faith and the walk therein prove this descent (Rom. iv. 12).—Ver. 8.—O man be assured, all thy temptations also, and needs, He hath seen beforehand! Only go with confidence to the Scripture, therein to seek God's consolations.—Who reads the Old Testament enough with the view of finding Christ every where therein?

Ver. 9. Berlenb. Bible:—Already with Abra-

ham began the stream of blessing that proceeds from God to believers. This now is the blessing of the one God, flowing from the like grace of God, even though in the most manifold manifestations.—Companionship in blessing a blessed companionship.—Wilt thou have blessing? Believe! Other way there is none.—We see then, where the trouble is, if one finds in his soul no such well-being or blessing, but rather the curse, and disquietness in his conscience. It is in this matter of faith, which a man will not frankly receive from God, and let old matters go, and deny them for Christ's sake. But a man must himself be *of faith*, as Paul here expresses it, that is, thou must have so committed thy heart to the Spirit of Christ, that He has been able to gain possession of thee, and through faith bear thee as a child of God Then is a man "of faith," that is, he has, as to the spirit, a Divine origin.

Ver. 10. "As many:" let there be as many of them as there will; and were there of them as many again who declare for this party and make their boast and glory of it, and will have their salvation from it.—"Of the works of the law:" this expresses the inner ground of the man, what fashions his soul, and whose child he is. It is not people who teach the law, but such as are born of the same. It means not: who give diligence to live after the measure of the law, but who live legally, take here a work and there a work, approach therewith before God, and so place themselves under the curse. "Under" signifies imprisonment, for these people bar themselves in.—LUTHER:—Our Lord God has two manner of blessings, a bodily, that appertains to this life, and a spiritual, that appertains to the life everlasting. Such bodily blessing have the ungodly in fulness and abundance. To banish the eternal curse, that is, the eternal wrath of God, death and damnation, there avails neither the world's nor the law's righteousness. Therefore those that have not more than the corporeal blessing alone, are for this reason not God's children, and blessed before God, but under the curse they are and abide.—If now God's law puts men under a curse, how much more other laws, which are of much less worth?

HEUBNER:—If we will be saved by the law, we must do all, and must be able to say, that we have never neglected any thing commanded, nor done any thing forbidden. In brief, the matter stands thus: if we will merit salvation, amazingly little will come of it, for our virtue is piece-work; against one or two legal performances God can oppose ten transgressions. Whoever does not view the requirements of the law with the diminishing glass of light-mindedness, and his own works with the magnifying glass of self-love, must acknowledge this.—[JOHN BROWN:—It is absurdity thus to seek for justification from that which is and must be the source of condemnation. To expect to be warmed by the keen northern blast, or to have our thirst quenched by a draught of liquid fire, were not more, were not so incongruous.—R.]

Ver. 11. CRAMER:—The religion that teaches us to believe that we are saved by grace without works, is the true, original, Catholic religion, to which also Habakkuk and the old prophets bear witness; therefore the Romish religion, which contradicts this, can be neither the original, nor the true Catholic church, but must be a new church.—STARKE:—The regenerate, who are already righteous through faith, continue in their righteousness and blessedness, and become at the last perfectly blessed, but still only through faith.

Ver. 12. The law will have doers, that deserve Heaven by works. The gospel will have only sinners, who have done working, but who, repenting them of their sins (or broken into contriteness by the law), seek medicine, help and grace in Christ and His Father's compassion. They now see aright their guiltiness, together with the loathsomeness of sin; they now first understand and love Moses aright, and walk after his law; not out of constraint or hope of reward, but as being already righteous in Christ, and minded to show forth the profit, purpose, joy and might of such righteousness in all manner of works possible.

Ver. 13. LUTHER:—God hath cast all sin of all men upon His Son. Then forthwith comes the law, accusing Him and saying: Here find I this one among sinners, yea who hath taken all men's sins upon Himself, and bears them, and I see in the whole world besides not another sin, except upon Him alone; therefore shall He suffer for it and die the death upon the cross.—Insomuch then as through this only Mediator, Jesus Christ, Sin and Death are taken away, without doubt the whole world were so pure that our Lord God therein could see nothing except mere righteousness and holiness, if we only could believe it.—On that side there is no lack. But the lack is with us, who believe it so faintly. If we believed it fully, doubtless we should already have been blessed and in Paradise, but the old sack, that still hangs around our neck, holds us back from arriving at such certain faith.—We should not look at Christ after the flesh, as if He were a man, righteous and holy for Himself alone, and having nothing to do with us. True it is that Christ is the holiest person of all, but thou must not stop with that knowledge, that does not yet give thee Christ. But thou knowest Him aright, and obtainest Him for thy own, when thou believest that this holiest Person of all has been bestowed upon thee by the Father, that He should be thy High-priest and Saviour, yea, thy minister and servant, who should lay from Him His own innocence and holiness, and take upon Him thy sinful person, and therein bear thy sin, death and curse, and thus become a sacrifice and a curse for thee, that He might so redeem thee from the curse of the law.—All virtue lies in the little words: for us.

[Two curses are here mentioned by Paul. The one: "Cursed is every one that continueth not," *etc.* That curse lay on all mankind. The other: "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." This curse Christ took, that He might redeem us from the first. Both were curses in and of the law. The one specifies the guilt, the other the punishment. Christ bore the accursed punishment, thus He takes away the accursed guilt. He stood for the "every one" who continueth not, by becoming the *very one* who hung upon the tree.—R.]

[WORDSWORTH:—How much reason have we

to abominate *our sins*, which were the principal causes of the crucifixion of Christ! They were indeed the traitors which, by the hands of Judas, delivered Him up. The Jewish priests were but our advocates; we by them did adjudge and sentence Him. Pilate was but our spokesman, the Roman executioners were but our agents therein. The Jewish people were but proxies acting our parts; our sins were they which cried out: "Crucify Him," with clamors more loud and more effectual, than did all the Jewish rabble.—The second Adam hung on the tree in Calvary, in order that by hanging on the tree He might abolish the sin committed by us in the first Adam, when he ate of the fruit of the tree of good and evil in Paradise.—There on the cross He extends His hands to all and calls all—Gentiles as well as Jews.—R.]

Ver. 14. LANGE:—The blessing comes not alone *from* Christ, but also *in* Christ. For whoever does not receive it in Christ, receives it not from Christ; as indeed many wish to have it from Christ, but not to take it in Christ, that is, receive it so that they thereby suffer themselves to be brought into His fellowship and in it enjoy the blessing with large addition.

On the whole Section:—The Christian's walk, a walk in the footsteps of the faith of Abraham.—Those who occupy themselves with works of the law, are under the curse: (1) a fearful word, (2) yet only too true.—Blessing or Curse? Other alternative there is none.—Christ has turned the curse into blessing.—The redemption from the curse of the law through Christ.—He became a curse for us. (1) How is that possible? and yet (2) it was necessary, for (3) thereupon rests our salvation.—Our righteousness before God is grounded alone upon faith: (1) this is taught by Abraham's example; (2) proved by the promise given by God to Abraham; (3) attested by the innermost essence of the law; (4) made sure by the redemption established by Christ.—Only through faith in the Crucified One have we part in the redemption accomplished by Him. I. That faith generally is the condition, vers. 6–12. (1) Proof from the example of Abraham's faith, vers. 6–9; (*a*) on account of his faith was Abraham accounted righteous before God, ver. 6; (*b*) the promise given to him of the blessing of the Gentiles, presupposes in these also faith. (2) Demonstration from the impossibility of any one being redeemed from the curse of the law through any manner of works, vers. 10–12. II. That the redemption accomplished by Christ is the essential matter [*Inhalt*] of faith on Him. (1) That Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law; (2) that He has effected this by Himself becoming a curse for us.—The death of Christ deserves an imperishable remembrance, because in it He became a curse for us. (1) He became a curse for us: (2) Therein lies the power of His death for blessing.

[COWPER:—
Oh, how unlike the complex works of man,
Heaven's easy, artless, unincumbered plan!
No meretricious graces to beguile:
No clustering ornaments to clog the pile.
From ostentation as from weakness free,
It stands, like the cerulean arch we see,
Majestic in its own simplicity.
Inscribed above the portal, from afar
Conspicuous as the brightness of a star,
Legible only by the light they give,
Stand the soul-quickening words—BELIEVE AND LIVE.]

---

b. Demonstration from the chronological relation of the Lord to the Covenant of Promise.

(VERS. 15–18.)

(Vers. 16–22. *The Epistle for 13th Sunday after Trinity.*)

15 Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though *it be* but a man's covenant,
yet *if it be* [*when it has been*][1] confirmed, no man disannulleth [annulleth][2] or addeth
16 thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. [Now to Abraham were the promises made and to his seed.][3] He saith not, And to seeds, as of
17 many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And [Now] this I say,
that the covenant, [A covenant][4] that was confirmed before of God in Christ [that has been before confirmed by God to Christ][5], the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul [does not invalidate][6] that it should make the
18 promise of none effect [make void the promise]. For if the inheritance *be* of the
law, *it is* no more of promise: but God gave [hath freely granted][7] *it* to Abraham by [through] promise.

[1] Ver. 15.—[Κεκυρωμένην, simply "confirmed." If anything be supplied, it need not be in the conditional form of the E. V.—R.]

[2] Ver. 15.—["Disannulleth" is now obsolete, the simple form being of precisely the same signification. "Addeth thereto" *i. e.* new conditions.—R.]

[3] Ver. 16.—[The change in order is necessary to emphasize "and to his seed." Ἐρρέθησαν, ℵ. A. *et al.* Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, *et al.*, instead of Ἐρρήθησαν, Rec.—R.]

4 Ver. 17.—[The structure of this verse is cumbrous, but the insertion of "that" renders it still more so.—R.]

5 Ver. 17.—Εἰς Χριστόν is lacking in several MSS. including א. The connection however favors the belief in its genuineness, since otherwise the argument in ver. 16 would hardly be turned to practical account. [Omitted in א. A. B. C. many versions, by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Lightfoot. Retained by Griesbach, Wordsworth, bracketted by Ellicott. If retained, may be rendered "to Christ," or "for Christ." See EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

6 Ver. 17.—[Οὐκ ἀκυροῖ—"cannot" may be implied, but is not expressed. "Invalidate" is preferable to "annul," as the Greek word differs from that rendered "annul" (ver. 15).—R.]

7 Ver. 18.—[Κεχάρισται, "has given freely," "given of grace." We have no single word to express it.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 15.—[**Brethren.**—An affectionately pathetic address. How different from ver. 1! The tone is greatly softened.—MEYER. "Here is a pause, at which the indignant feeling of the Apostle softens, and he begins the new train of thought which follows with words of milder character, and proceeds more quietly with his argument" (WINDISCHMANN).—R.]

I speak after the manner of men.—Κατὰ ἄνθρωπον. Paul thus excuses himself for comparing a man's διαθήκη with a διαθήκη of God, he will not (he says) regard the matter from a higher point of view, but simply according to the analogy of human relations. [CALVIN: "By this expression he intended to put them to the blush. It is highly disgraceful and base that the testimony of God should have less weight with us than that of a mortal man."—R.]

Διαθήκη is not to be taken here in the sense of covenant (although approved by MEYER and WIESELER). [See below.—R.] The sense is that of Testament. It is true God made with Abraham a covenant, hence God's covenant of promise with Abraham is here spoken of. But in these verses, Paul takes up this covenant in the aspect of a Testament, in order to emphasize the fact that in it God has made a free promise (of an inheritance) in contrast with the law, which imposes injunctions, making everything depend on merit. This character of the covenant of promise reminds him of a human Testament, and the principles of jurisprudence which are valid with respect to such an instrument, furnish the basis of his argument. [The majority of modern commentators take the other view. The reason here advanced is based upon the idea of "inheritance," which belongs to a covenant as well as to a Testament. The usage of the LXX. is decidedly in favor of the rendering "covenant." So the New Testament usage (the exceptional case, Heb. ix. 15-17, beginning with this idea also). So that while doctrinally considered it is not of much moment (CALVIN, who however prefers the meaning "covenant"), the order of the words and the comparison require this meaning (ELLICOTT). Comp. BAGGE, MEYER, LIGHTFOOT. The influence of the Vulgate in substituting "Testament" for "covenant" in the name of the two parts of the Bible is perhaps to be deplored.—R.]

No man annulleth—*i. e.*, of course, legitimately. [Ὅμως belongs here logically. But the sense is well preserved in the E. V.—R.]—**Addeth thereto**=adds specifications to it, of any kind whatever.—From what is true of a human Testament [or covenant], Paul now argues as to the Testament [or covenant] of God; this also "no one annulleth or addeth thereto"—"no one" and hence not "the law" either. But before he draws this conclusion (ver. 17), he furnishes (ver. 16) the necessary premises for it (WIESELER). He does this, by showing that the διαθήκη referred to the time after as well as before the giving of the law, and *in substance* remains still in force, without which necessary link the demonstration, that the law made no change in the character of the διαθήκη, would be without value or meaning. For if the διαθήκη had been of limited duration, confined to Abraham for instance, if the promise had been made only to him, it would, when the law came, have been long before fulfilled and thereby done away; the two would not have come in contact. But this is not the case.

Ver. 16.—**Now to Abraham were the promises made** [lit. **were spoken**], **and to his seed.**—This, as shown by "were spoken," and still more by what follows, refers to particular passages, and such moreover as contain the clause "and to thy seed" as also the promise of an "inheritance;" not, therefore, such as Gen. xxii. 18[?], but xiii. 15; xvii. 8 (and according to the LXX. also xxiv. 17). The sense is therefore: not merely to Abraham was there in the διαθήκη a promise, *sc.*, of an inheritance, made by God, but also to his seed; the διαθήκη was not exhausted in him, but was valid also for his seed. But especially must it be shown that it has validity *even now*. Therefore, says Paul, inasmuch as these promises were given "also to the seed of Abraham," they were given also to Christ. This seed of Abraham (he says), is indeed no other than Christ. This, he says, follows from the very fact of the singular form "his seed" being used. "In order to explain this emphasizing of the singular form in the exegesis of Paul, appeal has been made to the fact that the Rabbins of his time also now and then strain the singular or plural to serve an exegetical turn, and in the passages Gen. iv. 25; xix. 32, themselves explain זֶרַע of the Messiah. This comparison is admissible, if only we do not overlook the extraordinary contrast which exists between ordinary Rabbinical caprice, and Paul's exposition in this passage. That in the Abrahamic promise the idea of the Messiah is concealed, and that the 'seed of Abraham' may be actually understood of the Messiah, is unquestionably the true view, on which the whole exposition of Paul rests, and which he has a little before demonstrated from the connection of Scripture and the deepest reality of the fulfilled truth. But the form in which he, in this passage, rather casually than otherwise, expresses this view, correct in itself, namely, that it is already indicated by the use of the singular in the text which gives the Abrahamic promise, appears to demand the explanation given by most interpreters, as derived from the Rabbinical training of his youth." WIESELER.

[The ground of this assumption of Rabbinical method in his argumentation is this: that the stress of the argument rests on a grammatical

error: the Hebrew word, which he renders σπέρμα, having no plural answering to σπέρματα or "seeds." Granting this, it must yet be remembered that the consequences involved in an admission of such "playing" with Divine truth, in a writer, who claims to speak for God, are too grave, to permit us to make such an admission hastily. Is there no other reasonably satisfactory explanation, which denies any Rabbinical influence, implying the slightest quibbling? If there be, justice to such a writer as Paul, aside from any reverence for this Epistle as inspired, should lead us to adopt it. JEROME's application of κατὰ ἄνθρωπον to this verse is hardly allowable. He would not intentionally weaken his own cause thus. LIGHTFOOT well says: "It is quite as unnatural to use the Greek plural with this meaning as the Hebrew. This fact points to St. Paul's meaning. He is not laying stress on the particular word used, but on the fact that a singular noun of some kind, a collective term, is employed, where τὰ τέκνα or οἱ ἀπόγονοι, for instance, might have been substituted. Avoiding the technical terms of grammar, he could not express his meaning more simply than by the opposition 'not to thy seeds, but to thy *seed*.' The singular collective noun, if it admits of plurality, at the same time involves the idea of unity." ELLICOTT: "We hold that there is as certainly a mystical meaning in the use of זֶרַע in Gen. xiii. 15; xvii. 8, as there is an argument for the resurrection in Exod. iii. 6, though in neither case was the writer necessarily aware of it. As the word in its simple meaning generally denotes not the mere progeny of a man, but his posterity viewed as one organically-connected whole; so here in its mystical meaning it denotes not merely the spiritual posterity of Abraham, but Him in whom that posterity is all organically united, the πλήρωμα, the κεφαλή, even Christ. This St. Paul endeavors faintly to convey to his Greek readers by the use of σπέρμα and σπέρματα." Comp. WORDSWORTH, OLSHAUSEN *in loco*. How Pauline this conception is, will appear to every student of the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians. Paul's Rabbinical training undoubtedly made him quick and close in discrimination respecting the Old Testament; that it ever made him quibble, and institute false distinctions is against his character as well as against his inspiration.—R.]

That any explanation of the passage which maintains that Paul does not mean to interpret "seed" of the person of Christ is incorrect, needs no proof. [Against this, see ALFORD *in loco*. —R.] Doubtless, secondarily, those who are "of Christ" are also "the seed of Abraham" (ver. 29), but it is only because, primarily, Christ is this seed. This reference of "seed" to the person of Christ is not disproved by alleging that thereby the διαθήκη, the inheritance would be promised to Christ as well as to Abraham. But, it may be asked, is then the inheritance promised to Christ; is He designated as the Heir, and not rather as the Mediator and Bringer of the inheritance? Doubtless the latter, but primarily He is Himself the universal Heir; therefore in ver. 19 he is called distinctly the universal Heir: "the seed to whom the promise was made." Let us only vividly apprehend the course of prophecy that sketches the history of redemption. The Messiah Himself, according to it, is He who occupies the promised inheritance, that is, who takes full and abiding possession of it, and by this very fact, brings in the time of salvation and of God's kingdom. The conception is therefore one somewhat different from that in ver. 14, but both are equally according to truth, and the two modes of conception are most intimately connected. For Christ is certainly the Heir, only, He is the Heir in order to procure for His people the participation of the inheritance and therewith the blessing of God. And, as is self-evident, it is this truth, namely, that He in turn *brings* the inheritance into the possession of His *people*, which is here mainly in mind. Inasmuch as the διαθήκη had reference to Him, it had and has reference also to those that are "Christ's"; the question as to them therefore still remains to be answered; nay, it is as to them that it occurs, *how* they become partakers of the inheritance promised in the covenant. For that the covenant with the promise of the inheritance is valid also for the Christian dispensation, that it is "confirmed by God to Christ," is only one side of the truth. On the other side it was maintained with reference to the law that had come between, that the attainment of the inheritance had now become encumbered with the condition of the fulfilment of the law, that it came now *of the law* and no more *simply* "*of promise*." This assertion Paul now opposes, by applying what was said in ver. 5 about a covenant in general, to the covenant of God.

Ver. 17. **A covenant that has been before confirmed by God to Christ.**—This passage, as WIESELER says, is rightly understood only by considering that the assertion which Paul undertakes to refute is not the assertion of an entire abrogation of the Abrahamic covenant by the law, but only that of a modification in the Judaistic sense by the law of an invalidating, so that it should make void *the promise* (which would be an "invalidating," because thereby the character of the covenant as a promise given by grace, and thus its specific peculiarity would be taken away). This alone gives the sense of ver. 18: I have a right to say: it "does not invalidate that it should make void the promise;" *for* if the inheritance is obtained by law, it no longer comes "of promise;" but "of promise" it *is* to come, for it was assured by God to Abraham through promise, and of grace. We cannot therefore concede an invalidating, so that the promise is made void through the law, for this would take away something essential to the covenant; but, according to ver. 15, this cannot be.—[Various interpretations of εἰς Χριστόν have been suggested. The simplest and most obvious one is: "unto Christ," *i. e.*, as the second party to whom the covenant was ratified. ELLICOTT suggests "to be fulfilled in Christ," and renders "for Christ." Perhaps that of WORDSWORTH is implied: "*unto Christ:* so as to tend toward, and be consummated in Christ as its end, who, as man, sums up all Abraham's seed in Himself." But on the whole it is best to reject the words as a gloss.—R.]

The law which was four hundred and thirty years after.—Paul has taken the number from Exod. xii. 40, but apparently from the

text of the LXX. which adds *καὶ ἐν γῇ Χαναάν* thus including the sojourn of the patriarchs in Canaan (as do also the Samaritan text and Josephus *Ant.*, 2, 15, 3), while according to the Hebrew text this number covers only the duration of the sojourn in Egypt. Therefore "it is hardly to be said, that Paul has here made a mistake of memory, but only that, on account of his Greek-speaking readers, who used the Septuagint, he has here, as commonly in his Old Testament citations, adhered to the tradition of the LXX., which he could the more easily do, because the precise numbers of the years was a matter of no moment." WIESELER. [Though the precise number is of no moment as respects Paul's argument, the chronological difficulty is a grave one. The period from the call of Abraham to the departure of Jacob into Egypt is fixed at two hundred and fifteen years. The question is: must we compute the sojourn there as extending over four hundred and thirty years, or only two hundred and fifteen years. The Hebrew text, Exod. xii. 40, seems to demand the former term (and also Stephen, Acts vii. 6, "four hundred years," as in the prophecy Gen. xv. 13, both of which passages give round numbers). The latter term is that of the commonly received chronology. If it be adopted, the difficulty is thrown mainly upon the passage, Exod. xii. 40, to which the LXX add as above. ALFORD and ELLICOTT suggest this strong point in favor of the shorter term, viz., that from the data respecting ages and births, the longer term would make the age of Jochebed, the mother of Moses, at least two hundred and fifty-six years when Moses was born. So that the longer term makes the accurate statement of numbers overthrow the accurate statement of genealogies and events, which was far less likely to be tampered with. The gloss, if it be a gloss, of the LXX. affords the easiest solution of the difficulty, and Gen. xv. 40, Acts vii. 6, are then to be explained in the same way. Comp. USHER, WINDISCHMANN, HALES.—R.]

Ver. 18. **But God hath freely granted it to Abraham through promise.**—Prominence is to be given to the fact that God has not limited His promise, which He gave to Abraham, by conditioning it on a fulfilment of the law, but that it was a promise of pure grace; therefore, says Paul, God has, out of grace, by means of promise, bestowed, *s. c.*, the inheritance on Abraham, *i. e.*, not put him in actual possession, but assured it to him. The two expressions, "freely granted," and "through promise," are conjoined to exclude most definitely the idea "of the law."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Epochs of Revelation.* In the preceding section, as well as this, Paul has not cared to conduct a Scripture demonstration merely by the citation of isolated passages, but has used a freer and nobler method with the Scriptures. He showed in the revelation of God to Abraham a prophetic setting forth of the perfect revelation of God exhibited in Christ (especially at the close of ver. 14 had this become evident), and thus placed the Scripture in the light of a history of the revelation of redemption. This view of it has become, in the present section (as far as to chap. iv. 2), the controlling one. The law also here constitutes for him an epoch of the revelation of God, so that there are three of these epochs represented by Abraham, Moses, and Christ. They are not, however, simple stages of development, but the first and the third belong essentially together in one order, as germ and fruit; for the middle epoch, so diverse in character, a false claim is made, which it is his endeavor to refute, and to assign and establish its just position.—The suggestions which Paul here gives are important starting points for a just historical apprehension of Revelation, and at the same time an example of a proper adjustment of relations and reconciliation of apparent contradictions in it.

2. *The Law is not a complement of the Covenant of Promise.* It is not till in the next section that the purpose and meaning of the law, and its relation to the covenant of promise, are expounded positively. The negative proof, however, here adduced, is of itself important; viz.: That the law is not, and is not to be regarded or treated as a complement and rectification of the Covenant of Promise, so that whatever at first was freely promised as a boon "should be now encumbered with a burdensome condition." Or rather, this was so, indeed, but only for a time, for a definite season (as is shown afterwards). In this way, however, the inheritance was not *actually* attained, but as it was originally assured purely by promise, so is it now attained only through faith, the subjective correlative of the promise; and only this is required.

[3. *The sum of the Apostle's argument.* "This, then, is the sum of the Apostle's argument: A ratified, unrepealed constitution, cannot be set aside by a subsequent constitution. The plan of justification by believing was a ratified and unrepealed constitution. The law was a constitution posterior to this by a long term of years. If the observance of the law were constituted the procuring cause or necessary means of justification, such a constitution would necessarily annul the covenant before ratified, and render the promise of more effect. It follows, of course, that the law was appointed for no such purpose. Whatever end it might serve, it could not serve this end; it could never be appointed to serve this end."—BROWN. What end it serves, the Apostle states in the section immediately following.—R.]

4. *Christ the Seed of Abraham.* "'Seed,' comprehends posterity generally, and therefore of course a plurality. But among this posterity one nevertheless was found upon whom the whole expectation of faith was directed, and through whom also all promise first received its fulfilment. As Christ at His actual coming into the world humiliated Himself to live as a man among men, and had to be discovered and sought out by means of the words and works that were His alone, in like manner was He in the promise also concealed, as it were, among the seed, or among the collective posterity of Abraham, so that only when the time was fulfilled could any plainly distinguish Him and say: This is Christ, this is He who sanctifies and blesses, who yet is of the same descent with those that are sanctified and blessed; therefore also He is not ashamed to call them brethren, and it was not unbefitting Him, that all should be comprehended in the one Seed."—RIEGER.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 15.—"Brethren."—Rieger: By this address the Apostle noticeably softens the sharpness used in the first verse. Nothing calls for so much consideration, for so thorough a mingling of sharpness and gentleness, as when men fall back under the law and the blindness as to the gospel conjoined therewith. For the bewitching arts of the prince of this world, which are implied therein, and the mischief to be feared therefrom, demand sharpness; the hunger and thirst after righteousness yet alive in the conscience, and the love to the truth, demand to be appealed to with the utmost possible tenderness.—In the word of God throughout there is much condescension to our weakness, or much that is presented in human style, suitable to our power of comprehension. God has also actually so arranged it, that between the visible and the invisible, between the ordinances in the realm of nature and in the realm of grace there is much that is similar, and we therefore through the images furnished us by our experience in human life, obtain a true conception of the ordinances of grace. The Incarnation of the Son of God has such an influence on the whole economy of God forward and backwards, that God everywhere deals with us after the manner of a man.—Lange:—Human ordinances and institutions, which in themselves serve for the outward well-being of human and civil society, are in themselves not to be contemned. Since God counts them worthy that His apostles should therewith make clearer the economy of His kingdom.—In Starke:—If a great lord gives us his hand and seal, we are satisfied and believe, that the heavens will fall before such a promise will be broken. Why do we not rather trust the sealed handwriting of our God who cannot lie.—"Addeth thereto."—In divine things the human addition is often discernible, but very improperly, often causing that nothing pure is left.—[So the annulling by the addition of the law would make void the promise.—R.]

Ver. 16.—Spener: In the Holy Scripture all is written with Divine wisdom, therefore no word, no letter, no arrangement of the words is settled at random.—Divine truth must be found in the Holy Scripture itself and the letter of it, and may not be expected by separate communication from the Holy Ghost. Else Paul could not insist upon a little word and thereupon rest his argument.—[Paul, who takes such a broad view of the Scriptures as the one great history of Redemption, is the one who notices the truth in the least details of the word. One need not be a loose expositor, in order to have broad views; the accurate reader is not contracted by his accuracy.—R.]

Ver. 17. Starke: Sacred chronology gives a great light, for a more accurate insight into the ways of God.—[How many read their Bibles, as if the whole were written at one time. They acknowledge a history there, but it sheds no light for them upon the great truth of God as a whole.—Abraham and Moses. How prominent, how related.—How often the followers of Christ stop at Moses, when they ought to go back to Abraham!—The covenant was confirmed of God to Christ. Through Abraham, indeed, yet it is essentially a covenant between God and our Redeemer. So the Old Covenant is the new and everlasting Covenant.—R.]

Ver. 18. Starke: It is impossible to have righteousness and salvation partly from the works of the law, and partly from grace. For these are opposing things, that destroy one another. It must either be of works alone or of grace alone; now it is not of works, therefore it is of grace alone.—Rieger:—So long, indeed, as the human heart in falsehood still parts its love between light and darkness, nothing were more pleasing, than if it could thus turn from side to side between the promise and its own merit, that is, if, so far as might be, it could boast itself of merit and the law, and where these were too scant, could put forward, under cover of the promise, the grace and merit of Christ. Then, moreover, there would be in this way no great need of going deep in either quarter; it would only be to bend a little to the law, and as to the appropriation of grace, it need not call for any very special humility. But with such a divided heart, one has neither access to grace, nor entrance into the everlasting inheritance.

All that we have from the Gospel or from the promise, is a gift, a free gift of grace, and nothing is attained by obedience as a condition. We are not, therefore, to regard a godly life as a condition of obtaining the blessings of grace, but as a part of the grace itself which the Lord shows us.—[How old this method of grace by covenant of promise! Older than Moses. Yet how new! for we never apprehend it until God reveals it to us by His spirit, and then it seems as though it were a revelation of something entirely new.—The benefits of the gospel are all through promise. Hence all of grace, all to faith, all for the glory of the Promiser!—R.]

2. **The law had undoubtedly its value, and that for the attainment of salvation itself, but only a preparatory, and therefore also a transitory value. Believers are free from it.**

(CHAP. iii. 19—iv. 7.)

a. The law had its own sufficient end, having respect to transgressions, and so far from opposing an obstacle to the promises, it had the office of preparing the way for their fulfilment, as a schoolmaster unto Christ.

(VERS. 19–24.)

19 Wherefore then *serveth* the law [lit. what then *is* the law][1]? It was added[2] be-
cause of [the] transgressions, till the seed should come to whom[3] the promise was
[has been] made; *and it was* ordained [being ordained][4] by [by means of] angels
20 in the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a *mediator* of one, but God is
21 one. *Is* the law then against the promises of God?[5] God forbid: for if there had
been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should [would]
22 have been[6] by the law. But [ἀλλά, But, on the contrary][7] the Scripture hath con-
cluded [shut up][8] all under sin, that [in order that] the promise by faith of [or in]
23 Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came we were
kept under the law, shut up [kept in ward, shut up[9] under the law] unto the faith
24 which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was [So that the law
hath been or become][10] our schoolmaster *to bring us* [omit *to bring us*] unto Christ,
that we might be justified by faith.

b. But for this very reason it has fulfilled its purpose, when it has brought us to faith, and believers, as children (sons) of God and heirs, are no longer under the law.

(VERS. 25–29.)

25 But after [now][11] that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.
26, 27 For ye are all the children [all sons] of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as
many of you as have been [were][12] baptized into Christ have [omit have] put on
28 Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is
neither male nor female [no male and female][13]; for ye are all [all are][14] one in
29 Christ Jesus. And [But, δέ] if ye *be* Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and [or
omit and][15] heirs according to the promise.

(Vers. 23–29.—*The Epistle for New Year's festival.*)

[1] Ver. 19.—[The E. V. is sufficiently accurate. Ellicott renders "what then *is the object of* the law?" Schmoller: *Wie verhält es sich mit dem Gesetz?*—R.]

[2] Ver. 19.—Griesbach and Scholz have ἐτέθη, which is not sufficiently supported. [So Rec., but προσετέθη is adopted by most modern editors.—The article should be retained with "transgressions" in the E. V. So Ellicott, Alford.—R.]

[3] Ver. 19.—Instead of ᾧ ἐπήγγελται, J. and many cursives, some Fathers also, have ὃ ἐπήγγελται; but this is poorly supported, probably arising from the fact that ᾧ was not understood.

[4] Ver. 19.—[The italics in the E. V. separate διαταγείς too much from the first clause, with which it is closely connected.—"By means of" brings out the purely instrumental force of διά.—R.]

[5] Ver. 21.—Τοῦ θεοῦ, bracketted by Lachmann. The omission is not well sustained. ℵ. retains it. [B. is the main authority for rejecting it. Meyer rejects it mainly on exegetical grounds.—R.]

[6] Ver. 21.—Ἂν ἐκ νόμου ἦν. [Rec.] There are different variations: ℵ. has ἐκ νόμου ἦν ἄν, the best attested order is ἐκ νόμου ἂν ἦν. [So A. B. C., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, critical editors generally.—R.]

[7] Ver. 22.—[The strongly adversative ἀλλά requires the insertion of "on the contrary" (Alford, Ellicott).—R.]

[8] Ver. 22.—[As the E. V. renders the same verb (συγκλείειν) ver. 23, "shut up," it is substituted here as less ambiguous than "hath concluded."—R.]

[9] Ver. 23.—Συγκεκλεισμένοι is in all probability the correct reading—not συγκλειόμενοι. Yet ℵ. has it [συνκλειόμενοι (sic.) The perfect of the Rec. is adopted by Tischendorf, De Wette, Meyer, Wordsworth, Ellicott (on critical and exegetical grounds). Lachmann, Scholz, Alford, Lightfoot, adopt the other. The order is changed; "under the law" seems to be best joined with "shut up."—R.]

[10] Ver. 24.—["So that the law hath become" is more literal. "Schoolmaster" is retained, since we have no better word with which to translate παιδαγωγός. "Tutor" (Alford) is no more exact.—"*To bring us*" is better omitted, since it presents but one side of the meaning.—R.]

[11] Ver. 25.—["Now" brings out the idea that *it is so*.—R.]

[12] Ver. 27.—[The aorist verbs in this verse are better translated by the simple past tense of the English.—R.]

[13] Ver. 28.—[The change of particles in Greek with this last pair is thus noted. On its peculiar force see EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[14] Ver. 28.—Εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. A. has ἐστε Χριστοῦ Ἰ. "But εἷς would easily be overlooked after the preceding ὑμεῖς, and then ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. was first followed by Χριστοῦ as a gloss, from the beginning of ver. 29, and afterwards supplanted by it. The reading ἓν instead of εἷς is an explanation." Meyer. ℵ. has ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν Χριστοῦ, but ἐν is marked doubtful [marked for erasure; the marks afterwards removed, ℵ.[3] reading as Rec.—It is doubtful whether we should read πάντες or ἅπαντες. ℵ. has the latter.—R.]

[15] Ver. 29.—Καί is omitted in good MSS., including ℵ., by some versions and Fathers. but may very easily have been overlooked, as it follows κατ' (Meyer). It is rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Scholz, [also by Meyer in 4th. ed., Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot, on the authority of ℵ. A. B. C. D. As Schmoller follows Meyer in retaining it, it may be rejected here on the same authority.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 19. **Wherefore then serveth the law?**—["What then is the object of the law?"—R.] If the inheritance is not to come by the law, but still "of promise," the objection is obvious: why then did not God suffer the promise to stand alone? Why then did the law come afterwards? Certainly this was in that case superfluous!—To this Paul answers, in effect, thus: was the law then purposeless, if it had not precisely *this* purpose, of mediating the obtaining of the inheritance? Could it not have another purpose? Yes, this was the case, it had a purpose, but one very different from that of being the means of securing the inheritance. What then?

The direct answer is not given immediately, but is introduced with: "**It was added because of the transgressions.**—This means, simply, on account of transgressions was the law added. "Transgressions," multiplying and becoming aggravated, gave, in the first place, occasion for adding the law, necessarily brought it to pass that God came with respect to His people into an *entirely* different, more distant relation than existed, in the covenant of promise, between Him and the patriarchs. Instead of the more fatherly relation existing hitherto, God was constrained to place Himself in a relation involving the exercise of severe discipline, involving rigorous requirements and commands, nay, sharp threatenings, as it is afterwards expressed: "We were kept in ward, shut up under the law." And as this relation so different from the former had been occasioned by "transgressions," it was of course precisely in its right place where the "transgressions" of men prevailed, and it was designed, with reference to this, not so much in order to prevent them, as rather, by its commandments and prohibitions, and the threatenings annexed, to bring them under a more stringent accountability (which now first became possible), and a plainly expressed curse. Comp. EWALD: In order, because offences had come into the world, to punish them the more severely. (At first the judgment of death had kept the sense of sin alive. As men now were too accustomed to this, the law then came, and therewith the stricter imputation of sin, the curse more severely denounced, the obedience more rigorously required. RIEGER.) At the most this is as far as we are to go in the explanation of παραβάσεων χάριν. A more precise declaration as to the positive purpose of the law in relation to "transgressions" is not yet given here; and cannot therefore be deduced from the general expression; for then the second objection (ver. 21) would no longer be possible; it is in the refutation of this that Paul first expresses himself more particularly. The common explanation therefore: "For the sake of transgressions" = to induce them (agreeably to what Paul elsewhere says of the effect of the law to promote sin), is at least in no way indicated. The question whether Paul had it in mind would not arise before vers. 22, 23, 24. That the word χάριν does not necessitate this explanation, is shown by such passages as Luke vii. 47; iii. 12. [The view here suggested seems to be in the main that of ELLICOTT and WORDSWORTH (*Milton. Paradise Lost*, vii. 285). The purpose of the law as here set forth was, not (1) to prevent transgression, nor (2) to create, multiply transgressions, though elsewhere this is mentioned as its effect, but (3) to bring to light "the transgressions" of it already occurring and to occur, to make them "palpable, to awaken a conviction of sin in the heart, and make man feel his need of a Saviour" (ELLICOTT). Thus "the law had a supplementary, parenthetical, provisional and manductory character, and came in, as it were, *incidentally*" (WORDSWORTH).—R.] To this purpose of the law there then agree also:

1. The limited duration of its binding force, continuing only **till the seed should come,** for with that its purpose in reference to "transgressions" was fulfilled. (Why? is answered ver. 23, sq.) "The seed" **to whom the promise has been made** (see on ver. 16) is Christ, for He is the universal Heir; those who are Christ's are then, it is true, included also in this seed, and become therefore joint-heirs with Him (ver. 29). 2. The manner of its origin: **ordained by means of angels in the hand of a mediator.** As agents in giving the law (not as its authors), Paul designates the angels, agreeably to the ancient tradition, which appears first LXX. Deut. xxxiii. 2 (not in the original); and also Heb. ii. 2; Acts vii. 53; Josephus, *Antiq.* 15, 5, 3, and in the Rabbins. "In the hand of a mediator"=Moses. Moses received the tables of the law from God, and brought them down to the people. "In the hand" is therefore to be taken strictly. The explanation of most of the Fathers [so BARNES.—R.] referring it to Christ is incorrect. [LIGHTFOOT remarks: "It will be seen that St. Paul's argument here rests in effect on our Lord's Divinity as its foundation, otherwise He would have been a mediator in the same sense in which Moses was a mediator. In another and a higher sense St. Paul himself so speaks of our Lord (1 Tim. ii. 5)."—R.] SCHNEIDER refers it to the angel of the law, who, according to Jewish theology, had the special com-

mission to teach Moses the law. Unquestionably the Rabbins speak of an angel of the law, but it is no more possible to prove this Theologumenon to have existed in Paul's time, than it is to establish it from the Bible (MEYER). The purpose of this reference to the origin of the law is not to demonstrate its inferior dignity, and still less, indeed, is it, as even MEYER and WIESELER strangely assume, to bring the glory of the law, in the magnificence and solemnity of its institution, before the reader. The dignity of the law itself is not under consideration, but its design, as compared with the covenant of promise. We are not, in reading this verse, to pause without reason at προσετέθη, as though this were a complete idea, but should read the whole verse together. It is true, we first read: on account of transgressions it was added, but the complete statement is: on account of transgressions it was added in the definite way which is described, 1. by "till the seed," etc., 2. by "ordained by," etc. In this way did it originate, that is, 1. in an entirely different way from the covenant of promise; it was not an immediate giving of a promise, not a fatherly provision and agreement on the part of God, but was introduced by a mediation, and a double one, first of angels, and then, and not before, of a human mediator expressly chosen; the former mediation being on the side of God, the latter being given at the desire of the people themselves. ("How strangely does this appear in contrast with the former manifestations of God, in which the promises were given." REIGER.) This is meant to point out how much more of strangeness God used towards the people in the law, how much more distant a relation it established than the covenant of promise; how could it then have had the same purpose as the covenant?*—But this manner of origin 2. corresponded entirely with the purpose of the law as it has been stated: "because of the transgressions." As these made the law in general necessary, so, moreover, they were the reasons why God came, only through angels, into relation to His people, and that the people on their side had need of a mediator, to hold intercourse with God. The difference indicated in the latter circumstance between the law and the covenant of promise, is then moreover expressly dwelt upon in the following verse.

Ver. 20. **Now a mediator is not a mediator of one.**—The first words are simple and plain: A mediator (ὁ μεσίτης, the Art. generic) can never be mediator of a single party, the very idea presupposes more than one, two at least, between whom he is μέσος. The question can then only be, whether the design of the remark is, primarily, to express something respecting the mediator himself, personally, or something respecting his function. In the first case the sense would be: He belongs not merely to one, but to the two, the two parties between whom he mediates. So now here *in concreto:* the mediator of the law belonged to the two parties whose mediator he was, viz.: God and men; and the sense more particularly would be: therefore not merely to God, but also to men. The remark would then be intended as an affirmation respecting the nature of the law, that is, has not only a Divine, but also a human character.—Yet this explanation by no means commends itself. If we join ἑνός with οὐκ ἔστιν, the interpretation: He belongs not merely to one, is much less obvious than the other: He has to do not merely with one, but with two, mediates between two. Still simpler is the construction of EWALD, who joins ἑνός immediately with μεσίτης=the mediator of one is not, does not exist, is an impossibility. [So WORDSWORTH.—R.]

But God is one.—The words can mean nothing else: εἷς has a numerical signification, *i. e.*, it can have no other meaning than that of the preceding εἷς, hence not=the same, One with Himself, etc. It is these words especially that have given rise to such an enormous number of attempts at explanation. As regards these the reader is referred to the monographs of C. F. BONITZ, C. F. ANTON REIL, KOPPE, or the ordinary commentaries, such as those of MEYER and WIESELER, where the more important modern explanations are arranged in order. A detailed examination may be spared here, especially as the passage of itself is not doctrinally important. [MEYER thus remarks on the course of exegesis: "The many different explanations of the passage, and there must be more than 250 of them, have been thus multiplied especially in more modern times; for the Fathers pass lightly over the words, which are plain in themselves, without regarding their pragmatic difficulties, for the most part applying the first clause, which is generally taken correctly, to Christ, who is the Mediator between God and men, some however casting a side glance at the opponents of the Divinity of Christ. Although there was no special dogmatic interest connected with the passage, the variety of interpretations in the 16th and 17th centuries (see POOLE's *Synopsis*) was such, that every expositor of importance took his own separate course, yet without polemical spirit, since no dogmatical question was at issue. The variety has become still greater since the middle of the 18th century, especially since the rise of grammatico-historical exegesis (the philological errors of which exegesis it has however fully experienced), and is still increasing. How often too the absurdest fancies and crudest attempts have availed themselves of our text, the explanation of which seems to be regarded as an exegetical work of art!" He then answers fifteen of the later opinions, besides alluding to others. JOWETT reckons 430 interpretations! What a testimony to the amount of exegetical labor bestowed on the Scriptures! That too on a passage which is at best but a general statement in support of a single point in a long argument, which seeks not so much to set forth the gospel, as to remove mistaken views respecting the law! How thankful we should be that the gospel texts are so pellucid; had they been less so, we should doubtless have 250 interpretations of them also. As the exegesis now stands, it is perhaps better to admit that the verse is δυσνόητόν

* [JOHN BROWN: "The existence of a mediator is certainly no proof that a dispensation is not a dispensation of mercy, for the new covenant has a mediator. But the facts connected with the law being given by the hand of Moses as a mediator, plainly show that the law was not, in its literal meaning and direct object, a revelation of the way of obtaining the Divine favor."—R.]

τι (2 Pet. iii. 16). The passage is undoubtedly genuine, and does not refer to Christ. Thus much seems clear. Schmoller gives below an exposition, to which he has added in the second edition another (on which comment is made in the proper place). To this the reader will find added the views of ELLICOTT and LIGHTFOOT, which have been chosen on account of their clearness, a quality especially desirable, when the explanation has so often been *lucus a non lucendo.*—R.]

The question is mainly this: Is δέ (of the second clause) simply metabatic, or adversative? A decision in favor of the one view, gives an entirely different sense from that arrived at by adopting the other.—In the first case we have simply the minor premise of a syllogism, ὁ θεός is with εἷς subsumed under the εἷς denied with μεσίτης. The mediator is not a mediator of one, *now* God is one, therefore, &c. The conclusion now may be various. WIESELER gives it: Therefore the mediator has reference not *merely* to God, but also to men. But the thought that there is found in ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν, namely, God is only one party, appears to have too little force. EWALD gives it: Therefore the Mediator has not reference to God, for God is only one, consists not, for instance, of two internally distinct Gods, or of an earlier and later God; it is clear therefore that Moses as mediator, did not mediate, say between the God of the promise and the God of the law, and thereby confound the law with the promise, and so annul the former by what was latter and later, but that he only mediated between God and the people of that time. Ingenious, but far-fetched. The chief objection, however, to this whole view of δέ as metabatic is, that the following sentence in ver. 21 points too evidently in νόμος and θεός to a previous antithesis, from which then οὖν deduces an inference. The above-mentioned explanations are wanting in the recognition of the inner connection of the two verses (MEYER); the thought breaks off, and an entirely new one begins. Besides, according to EWALD's explanation the question as to a κατά would not have been in place here, as this κατά is precisely what the foregoing thought would have denied. Δέ is therefore doubtless to be taken adversatively, and the δέ of the first member is the metabatic δέ of a minor premise. Paul had said: The law was given through a mediator. Now with one there is no mediator, while on the other hand God is One, therefore it might be inferred that the law is against the promises. MEYER: ver. 20 contains two *loci communes*, from which a possible inference (ver. 21) with respect to the two concretes which are under consideration, is drawn. Sense: A mediator presupposes two, therefore also the law does; in the case of that, there were two parties, between which the mediator intervened;—on the other hand God is One, not a plurality; if the promise therefore, of which God is author (comp. vers. 18 and 21), had its origin through Him alone, there was only a single personage active thereby, it was a purely Divine act, not resting upon a contract of two parties. How entirely different in origin, therefore, was God's covenant of promise, from the law? (Was it not thereby clearly indicated, that the purpose of the law was not to be the same and therefore is not the same, as that of the covenant of promise, that therefore its purpose *in specie* cannot have been, to secure—directly—the κληρονομία for men?) But can it not be inferred from this, that the law is *against* the promises of God? that it stands in conflict with them? so that, because the law has come, the promises are no longer to be regarded as valid, and a fulfilment of them is not to be looked for; as at the giving of a constitution by compact between prince and people the qestion may arise whether previous promises given on one side are still to be fulfilled? The main point is to understand κατά (ver. 21) rightly (even MEYER does not explain this correctly). *One* objection, that the law is then purposeless, if "the inheritance is not of the law," Paul has refuted in vers. 19 and 20, by pointing to the fact that it was given for an entirely different purpose, as appears from the very manner of its origin. But out of this refutation of the first objection arises a second, whether by this superadding of the law (προσετέθη) the purpose of the covenant of promise be not hindered; first a free promise on the part of God (without regard to παραβάσεις), and then a *law*, coming through a mediator, who intervened between God and the people, originating therefore by a compact of God and the people (with definite reference to παραβάσεις); does not this then hinder the first, and so far do it away? —This abrogation however is not to be taken in the sense of ver. 17, that the law came in *the place of* the promise, so that the inheritance would now come "of the law," for this is already refuted, first by the very course of the argument ver. 15 sq. from the idea of a διαθήκη, then also by the refutation of the objection that then the law is purposeless, vers. 19, 20. The question in ver. 21 is to be understood as implying an apprehension that by the law the attainment of the inheritance (which, it is presupposed, according to the proof already given, can only be attained "by promise") may be hindered, may be made, comparatively speaking, impossible. It is not, therefore, the *form* of the "promise" which is here meant, but the *substance;* on which account we have here again the plural ἐπαγγελιῶν; the question being, whether the law does not render the fulfilment of the promises of God impossible. This alone gives a progress of thought, and this alone is entirely congruous with what follows. Paul now refutes this second objection also. The law in no wise interposes an obstacle to the promises of God, but rather, in itself, agrees fully therewith, nay, although it had not itself the ability or function of bringing the promises immediately into fulfilment, it was meant nevertheless to serve the purpose of rendering men partakers of this fulfilment by faith in Christ (vers. 23, 24), and with this the law itself then attained its end (ver. 25 sq.).

I allow this explanation, given in the first edition, to remain. It was grounded on that of MEYER, and has at all events this in its favor, in distinction from other explanations, that it puts ver. 21 in immediate connection with ver. 20, and understands the question in ver. 21 as seemingly resulting from ver. 20, while the other explanations, though otherwise having much in their favor, assume that the thought breaks off

with ver. 20, and that in ver. 21 Paul merely turns back to ver. 17 or 19.—However a new explanation of ver. 20 has been given by Dr. VOGEL in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1865, Heft 3, which, it is true, also fails to give a connection between ver. 20 and ver. 21, but which, on the other hand, points out the connection between vers. 19 and 20 with better success than usual, and which, in particular, gives due weight to the statement, the law was "ordained by means of angels." In the other explanations full justice has not been done to this statement, which though otherwise so abrupt, could not have been made without a purpose. VOGEL starts from the usually neglected point of the signification of *μεσίτης*, and shows that *μεσίτης* by no means signifies merely, and not even predominantly—as is commonly assumed in advance—one who stands in the midst between two, but that it means most commonly one who acts instead of some one, and cares for his affairs.—A genitive joined with it signifies either the matter, which is accomplished by the mediation, or the person whom the *μεσίτης* represents, or (which however cannot be shown of Paul's use of it) the several parties between whom he discharges his function (as in 1 Tim. ii. 5). When now it is said of the *μεσίτης*: *ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν*; this of course involves the positive affirmation: a mediator can only be the mediator of more than one. And here VOGEL admits that it would be most obvious to understand this plurality of a plurality of parties, between whom the mediator stands in the midst, but decides nevertheless in favor of the other interpretation of *μεσίτης*: representative—of several persons, for the discharge of their affairs. It is true a representative may very well represent one person only; but then we must understand a representation for the purpose of mediation. In that case it is most natural, only one having to conclude a compact, that he should do it in his own person. But if several have it to do, and that in such a way that the transaction cannot be completed by all, a mediation by one person acting instead of many becomes necessary, and such a person is a *μεσίτης*. The sense would then be: where a mediator appears, we are obliged to understand him as representing a number of persons. VOGEL is led to this interpretation, in the first place by the sentence immediately following: *ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν*=but (adversative) God is one. He therefore is not that plurality, which the mediator as such implies. Therefore—the strict logical inference—the mediator is not God's mediator, does not appertain as mediator to God. But whose mediator is this mediator? who is this plurality?

The answer, given ver. 19 is: *ἄγγελοι*—in these we have the plurality we were looking for. The law is, according to Paul, *διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων*. (Comp. ver. 15, *ἐπιδιατ*.: the law is not an *ἐπιδιαταγή* in the sense that the covenant of promise was thereby prejudiced, or destroyed; it is, however, a *προσδιαταγή*—comp. *προσετέθη*—which, however, was not intended to annul the covenant of promise, for it was only meant to be in force "till the seed should come," etc., that is, only for a time, only till the fulfilment of the covenant of promise should take place. The covenant, therefore, neither could nor should be in any way infringed upon.) The author of the law is not mentioned here, as He had not been at *προσετέθη*. Of course God is to be understood. But Paul is not specially engaged, in making this authorship prominent. He stops with declaring that the law was ordained—promulgated—through angels, having in mind thereby to place it on a lower level than the covenant of promise. With "in the hand of a mediator" (by which of course no one else than Moses is to be understood) Paul now proceeds to name the signs by which the inferior dignity of the law may be known. The disposition of it committed to the angels, took effect through a *μεσίτης*, who, it is manifest, is to be regarded then as their delegate. The angels, the sense might be, did not even themselves promulgate the law in their own person, but this was done through a (human) mediator. The sense therefore would be: ordained for men, that is, the people of Israel, through angels, who, moreover, availed themselves of a mediator.—Yet Paul, by "in the hand of a mediator," is not so much giving a fresh sign of the inferior rank of the law, as strengthening the previous affirmation, "ordained by angels." The circumstance that a mediator was engaged in the work, was not meant so much to explain the manner of the angelic ministration, as to establish the fact of it. The presence of a mediator was in Paul's mind closely connected with this, but by no means so closely connected in the current doctrine. How far this circumstance, that a mediator (namely, Moses) had a joint agency in the giving of the law, is a proof of this ministry of angels, is explained in ver. 20. "In the hand of a mediator" Paul has said and had to say: but where a *μεσίτης* is present, a plurality of parties represented by him is to be assumed; God however is not a plurality, but One: The law, therefore, at whose promulgation a plurality intervened, did not proceed from God, but from the angels (these being the only two parties conceivable)—and therefore form a plurality. The clause would not then be properly a proof (as indeed it is not introduced by *γάρ*), but the fact of the "being ordained in the hand of a mediator" would be simply alluded to for confirmation of the "by means of angels." It would then in fact be best to include the clause in a parenthesis. This interpretation is not disproved by the fact that in many other passages Moses is explicitly named as dealing with the people by commission from God Himself. Paul could still have the right to say that if in a single passage, as here, the giving of the law is represented as the work of angels, Moses must necessarily be regarded as their delegate; comp. Acts vii. 38.—It might also deserve attention, that in ver. 21 the *ἐπαγγελίαι* are expressly distinguished by the epithet *τοῦ θεοῦ*. Is not this connected with the fact that previously at the mention of the law, its Divine origin was entirely passed over and the giving of the law represented as the work of angels?

The question in ver. 21 would not then express a conclusion apparently resulting from the immediately preceding statement. It would rather express amazement, as to how any one could even imagine that the law, which is proximately to be referred to the angels, could invalidate the

promises of God. It is too weak for that. And what would thus be improbable on account of the mode of the law's origin, would then be further refuted by the truth, that the law is incapable of giving life.

Even on this interpretation of ver. 20, however,—independently of the explanation of σύν—the sense given by us to the κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν (see above) and to εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη (see below) might be preserved.

[The above view to which such prominence is given on account of its novelty and originality, is in all essential features the same as that of GFRÖRER (*Geschichte des Urchristenthums, das Jahrhundert des Heils; Erste Abtheilung*, pp. 228, 229, Stuttgart, 1838). So that, although thirty years old, it has met with less consideration from commentators than is here given to it in its revived form. As GFRÖRER himself intimates that this interpretation is "easy to be perceived by the eye which has been sharpened by accurate acquaintance with the Jewish mode of thought," it may be allowable to suggest that were this Paul's meaning, his Rabbinical training would be more apparent than in ver. 16. Besides this view would make Paul apparently disingenuous in his attempt to lower the claims of the law, which is God's law,—"through angels, by the hand of a mediator." And yet the chief peculiarity of this novel interpretation is its ignoring that fact. This vitiates the whole, in our view. As Schmoller remarks ver. 19, "the purpose of this reference to the origin of the law is not to demonstrate its inferior dignity."*

Subjoined is the view of ELLICOTT (2d ed.): "The context states briefly the four distinctive features of the law with tacit reference to the promise, 1) restricted and conditioned; 2) temporary and provisional; 3) mediately, not immediately, given by God; 4) mediately, but not immediately, received from God. Three of these are passed over; the *last* as the most important, is noticed; 'the law was *with*, the promise was without a mediator.' Ver. 20 thus appears a syllogism of which the conclusion is omitted: '*Now a mediator does not appertain to one* (standing or acting alone); *but* (in the promise) *God is one* (does stand and act alone); THEREFORE (in the promise) A MEDIATOR DOES NOT APPERTAIN TO GOD. *Is then the law* (a dispensation which, besides other distinctions, involved a mediator) *opposed to the promises which rested on God* (and involved no mediator)? *God forbid.*' According to this view the only real difficulty is narrowed to the minor proposition. *How* was God one? And the answer seems,—not because He is essentially unity, nor because He is one by Himself, and Abraham is one by himself, nor yet because He is both the Giver, the Father, and the Receiver, the Son, united (as held in ed. 1), but, with the aspect that the last clause of ver. 18 puts on the whole reasoning,—because He dealt with Abraham singly and directly, stood alone, and used no mediator." This has the merit of simplicity and is a safe view. LIGHTFOOT is perhaps not so close in his explanation, but it may well be added: "The very idea of mediation supposes two persons at least, between whom the mediation is carried on. The law then is of the nature of a contract between two parties, God on the one hand, and the Jewish people on the other. It is only valid so long as both parties fulfil the terms of the contract. It is therefore contingent and not absolute. *But God* (the Giver of the promise) is one. Unlike the law, the promise is absolute and unconditional. It depends on the sole decree of God. There are not two contracting parties, there is nothing of the nature of a *stipulation*. The Giver is every thing, the recipient nothing. Thus the primary sense of 'one' here is numerical. The further idea of unchangeableness may perhaps be suggested; but if so, it is rather accidental than inherent. On the other hand this proposition is quite unconnected with the fundamental statement of the Mosaic law, 'the Lord thy God is one God,' though resembling it in form."—R.]

Ver. 21. **God forbid. For if there had been a law,** *etc.*—That the law is not in the sense indicated "against the promises of God," Paul proves first by the consideration, that if a law had been given which could make alive, δικαιοσύνη would have proceeded from it, *i. e.*, not as it is commonly and altogether erroneously explained, in connection with the erroneous view as to the force of the objection: if a law that could do this had been given, and δικαιοσύνη came from it, then were the law actually "against the promises of God (a sense to which γάρ, rightly taken, is unsuitable); but Paul really wishes to show that the law accords with the promises, and cannot be intended to annul these; for if the law were able to make alive, δικαιοσύνη would actually proceed from it, that is the same effect which is to be wrought through the promises. The law cannot, therefore, in itself, have any tendency hostile to "the promises." But, he continues, "the Scripture has shut up all," *etc.*=the power to "give life" (ζωοποιεῖν) was, as it were, denied the law, in order that "the promise might be given by faith in Jesus Christ." It *could not* "give life," and thereby bring "righteousness," if only on account of the sins of men; but, in truth, it *was not* to do this, this was in no wise its design, for the promise was to come ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησ. Χρ.—**Given life.**—Ζωοποιεῖν = to make inwardly living, not = to give eternal life, for the sense is: if the law could awaken man from his death in sins, and give him spiritual life, "righteousness" (=δεδικαιωμένον εἶναι), would actually proceed from the law, for with the ζωοποιηθῆναι, the condition of justification would be of course perfectly realized. The conclusion is therefore from cause to effect. MEYER incorrectly takes it "from effect to cause," in connection with his explanation of ζωοποιεῖν as the bestowment of eternal life. The "making alive" is not indeed actually the cause of "justification," but this is only because a making alive through the law is not possible. It is however precisely this unrealized case, viz., a making alive through the law, that is here spoken of. [The being dead in sins is here taken for granted; what is meant by "life?" WIESELER's view is given above. MEYER as usual restricts it to future eternal life; but LIGHTFOOT well says, it includes "alike the spiritual life in the present and the glorified life in the future,

* [See TURNER *in loco*. to whose valuable remarks I am indebted for the discovery that this view is not a new one.—R.]

for in the Apostle's conception the two are blended together and inseparable." This seems to accord better with New Testament usage. The reasoning then is not from the whole to its part (ALFORD), for the "justification" is not strictly a part, but a condition of "life," nor from cause to effect, but from effect to cause. "Life" does not comefrom the law, it does not, was not designed to justify, it is not against the promise, but has another purpose afterwards set forth.—R.]—**Verily.**—Ὄντως = in fact, and not merely according to the fancy of the Judaizers, as is now the case, the hypothesis being denied.—**Righteousness.**—Δικαιοσύνη is of course not immediately identical with "the inheritance," but it is an essential element of it, and the one treated of throughout the Epistle, which to be attained by faith.

Ver. 22. **But on the contrary, the Scripture shut up all under sin.**—Συγκλείειν is the strengthened κλείειν, to shut up, (not to shut together): then more tropically with εἰς to deliver up as a prisoner to some one; and generally, to give up into the power of any one, to deliver over. Ὑπό in this verse and the next one expresses this state of subjection still more strongly. Ἡ γραφή: the Scripture, generally, the written word of God: not the law. Τὰ πάντα: the collective whole=all men;* as a fact, doubtless including Gentiles as well as Jews; although, as the context shows, the immediate reference is only to those who have the law, and of whom the Scripture speaks, that is, the Jews.—The sense of this somewhat peculiar expression is easily deduced from ver. 21. It is meant to explain, why the law (and generally, any law) *could not* make alive=impart spiritual life. "If the law had been able ζωοποιεῖν, then δικαιοσύνη would have proceeded from it; an impossible thing, for the Scripture has placed all under the power of sin," it was therefore not possible to fulfil the law and in this way to come to spiritual life; for the law certainly has not the power to destroy the dominion of sin, such a dominion as exists; it has not the power to break as it were the yoke of sin. But how far now can such a "shutting up under sin" be ascribed to the *Scripture?* Of course only in so far as it bears witness to this "being shut up." The sense therefore is: according to the testimony of the Scripture all are subjected under the power of sin=sin exercises a *dominion*, and that over all. This was the fault of men, but the active expression: the Scripture has done it, points nevertheless to an activity, which, it is true, could not have been exercised by the Scripture (for this, in itself, could only be a witness), but which yet was exercised by the Author of the Scripture, God. He has placed all under the *dominion* of sin (and that, as appears afterwards, with the design that the promise might be given by faith, *etc.*). But this, of course, He could only do for the punishment of men, on account of their "trangressions;" it is a punishment ordained of God, that sin should exercise a formal dominion over men.—The connection stated with the previous verse excludes an explanation which otherwise would have a good deal for it, especially because then a function would be ascribed immediately to the Scripture. The explanation is this: the Scripture has, by its declaration, its portrayal, as it were, shut up=subjected all men without leaving any escape or exception, to the *sentence:* Thou art a sinner! and therewith has also shut them up under the curse which sin brings.—Still less is it meant to be said that the Scripture constrains all to *acknowledge* that they are sinners. Nor is there any allusion here to the truth, that the law, instead of restraining sin, has promoted it. Unquestionably, however, we are warranted by what Paul elsewhere says of the law, to bring in this thought, not in order to explain the words, but in order to gain a clearer conception of the fact.

The purpose of this "shutting up all under sin" was, that "the promise" should not be given "by the law" but "by faith of Jesus Christ" and therefore that matters should proceed according to the "covenant" of God, that is, that the promised good should be given, in a certain sense attained, not by merit of works, but of free grace. (This was the purpose of God of course with the foreknowledge that this end, on account of the sinfulness of men, cannot be reached through the law.) But more specially this "shutting up under sin" had as its aim, **that the promise might be given** ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. For the law was given until the seed should come to whom it had been promised: this shutting up all under sin in consequence of which the law could not make alive, had therefore as its aim, that the promise should be given "by faith" on this Seed, that is, this Seed is Himself first made partaker of the promised good, since, according to ver. 16, the promises were given also to Him, and to others only through Him. Therefore also the duplicate expression **by faith of Jesus Christ—to them that believe.**—It no longer concerns the writer merely to show that the promise is given "by faith" or "to them that believe," agreeably to its original nature, and therefore really "of promise," or of grace. This has already been established in vers. 17, 18, but now, after the new epoch of the history of redemption, the epoch of law, is expressly called an adventitious [*hinzugekommene*] period, and the *sinful condition* of men having been made prominent, the discourse is directed more definitely to the point that the promise is given by faith on Jesus Christ, as the Redeemer, of grace therefore, but of grace ministered in this way. [It is perhaps best, with ELLICOTT and ALFORD, to take the genitive "of Jesus Christ" as both objective and subjective; the Object and the Giver of faith. St. Paul's opponents, as nominal Christians, might hold that the promise came to believers only, but he insists that it came not "by the law, but by faith of Jesus Christ." Hence there is no tautology (LIGHTFOOT)—R.]—"The promise:" here of course, in the objective sense, the object of promise. Taken generally this is=the inheritance; in a more special application that which is attainable for sinful men "by faith of Jesus Christ," is the "being justified," as is simply stated in ver. 24.—The pro-

*[CALVIN, BENGEL, ALFORD, JOWETT are disposed to give this a wider meaning: *omnia humana*, everything which men are, possess or can accomplish. But of this there is no indication in the context, the neuter being chosen because men are here regarded as a collective whole (MEYER).—R.]

mise, therefore, was to be given "by faith;" it was not possible "by the law" on account of sin: but before faith came, the law—and that on account of being shut up under sin—or more precisely, the peculiar position of men in respect to the law, was in its proper place, in order to open the way for the revelation of faith. This Paul says in ver. 23.

Ver. 23. **But before faith came.**—Neither here nor anywhere else [in N. T.] does πίστις mean the *doctrina fidem postulans*, the gospel, but subjective faith, which however is made objective. When men at the preaching of the gospel, believe on Christ, faith, which before was wanting, was now come, that is, it had entered, so to speak, the hearts of those who had become believers in Christ (MEYER).—**We were kept in ward, shut up under the law.**—"We"=the Christians from among the Jews. "Under the law" (ὑπὸ νόμον) is to be joined with "shut up" (συγκεκλ.), and this is then more closely characterized by "kept in ward" (ἐφρουρ.), which marks the transition to "unto the faith," *etc.* Paul then says first: We were "shut up under the law"=the law was the master to whose power, we were completely subjected, without any freedom of our own. And as such (shut up under the law), we were guarded, kept in ward (ἐφρουρούμεθα)=that we might not become free, in substance: we were held in subjection to the law. What now does this mean? Plainly it characterizes, briefly and strikingly, the nature of the law; it was a pressing yoke, a constraining power, to which men were subject. It was such by its continual holding up of commandments and prohibitions, and especially by what was connected therewith, the continual, terrifying denunciation of the curse in case of transgression in case of the non-fulfilment of the enjoined conditions. According to this, how can the condition of men under the law be more strikingly depicted than as a "being shut up under the law" [the perfect participle, which reading we retain, expressing this continued, permanent state.—R.], and because no manner of dispensation therefrom was bestowed in the whole epoch before faith was revealed as a συγκεκλ. φρουρεῖσθαι? [The meaning of ἐφρουρούμεθα is not "safely kept," but "kept in ward." We were shut up under the law and thus kept prisoners.—R.]

The purpose of this representation of the condition of law is no longer merely "to place in the light" still more clearly the great difference between the law and the covenant of promise in itself (as in vers. 19, 20), but it is now to be shown how the design of the law, in its deeper significance, nevertheless coincided with that of the covenant, how the former was preparatory to the perfecting of the latter. For "we were kept in ward, shut up under the law," says Paul, **unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.** This is to be taken not merely as temporal, but also as telic=for faith=to the end that it might be possible for faith to be revealed, the same faith therefore, in reference to which it had just been said, that the Scripture shut up all under sin, in order that the promise might be given *through it.* The direct aim of the law, therefore, was the revelation of this faith, and through this we are made partakers of the promise; so absolutely untrue is it, that it stood in the way of the promise.—"Revealed:" for "so long as men had not yet believed on Christ, faith had not yet come into manifestation, it was still an element of life hidden in the counsel of God, which, as a historical manifestation, was unveiled, when the congregation of believers came into being." MEYER. How far now was this being "kept in ward, shut up under the law" preparatory for faith, and pointing to it? This Paul does not state; we must fill out the statement for ourselves, which however is not difficult after the preceding remarks. The Scripture has shut up all under *sin.* But on the other hand these same were kept shut up under the law. What else was purposed thereby (since ζωοποιεῖν through it is already excluded), than to awaken and keep continually awake in the soul, the fearful consciousness of standing under the curse of the law (the curse comprehended in the law itself, against transgression of it, against sin), and by this very means, on the other hand, to ground more and more deeply in the soul the conviction of the impossibility of attaining to "righteousness" through this law. The first effect, the consciousness of deserving the curse is elsewhere (comp. ii. 19) designated by Paul as a "dying," and this operation of the law as a "killing." Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 6. In this way it led to the revelation of faith in men's hearts, as to the only way of escape yet possible, or, it led to the longing for a redemption from sin, and thus made men willing for faith on the Redeemer given by God in Christ. [This was the result, but the state "under the law" was still objectively real, whether this consciousness were awakened or not. ELLICOTT remarks on the unusual order, that it "seems intended to give prominence to μέλλουσαν, and to present more forcibly the contrast between former captivity and subsequent freedom." Comp. Rom. viii. 18.—R.]

Ver. 24. **So that the law hath been.**—Ὥστε: an inference. The fact of this "being kept in ward," etc., "unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed" made the law **our schoolmaster.**—This name it deserves, and that for a twofold reason: 1. The παιδαγωγός* approaches his charge with commands and prohibitions, nay, sometimes with threats of punishment, and in general, with limitations of his freedom, and lays upon him in this respect a stringent yoke; there takes place a keeping in ward, shut up under him. This limitation of freedom, and in general this whole relation of subjection, is not however an end in itself, but

* [As Schmoller omits any detailed reference to the word παιδαγωγός, ALFORD'S note may well be inserted here: "The παιδαγωγός was a faithful slave, entrusted with the care of the boy from his tender years till puberty, to keep him from evil physical and moral, and accompany him to his amusements and studies. The E. V. '*schoolmaster*' does not express the meaning fully; but it disturbs the sense less than those have done, who have selected one portion only of the pedagogue's duty and understood by it, 'the slave who leads the child to the house of the schoolmaster;' thus making Christ the schoolmaster, which is inconsistent with the imagery." So LIGHTFOOT: "This tempting explanation ought probably to be abandoned. Even if this sense did not require πρός Χριστόν or εἰς Χριστοῦ, the context is unfavorable to it. There is no reference here to our Lord as a teacher. 'Christ' represents the freedom of mature age, for which the constraints of childhood are a preparation. Comp. Eph. iv. 13."—R.]

has place only as a means to an end, serves a higher purpose, namely, that the pupil may be *trained* for mature age, and for the assuming of that higher grade, for which he is destined; "kept in ward, shut up" only "unto" that, which is afterwards to be revealed. And, according to ver. 23, the function of the law also had precisely this twofold aspect.—This goal that was set for attainment, the second point, was the main thing with the pedagogy of the law; this, therefore, is expressly stated in the added phrase (hath been our schoolmaster) εἰς Χριστόν, **unto Christ**. — This is unquestionably relic; this again is more precisely explained by **that we might be justified by faith**. — The goal was Christ=justification by faith in Him. Justification, which the law itself could not bring, because "shutting us up under sin," it was yet to open the way for, to conduct to; because it could not itself bring it, was yet to impel to the seeking and attaining of it "by faith."

Ver. 25. **But after that faith is come**, *etc.* —The law was preparatory to faith in Christ (and so far, indeed, in agreement with the covenant of promise), but for the very reason that it was preparatory, it had only a temporary validity, it ceased with the coming of that for the coming of which it was meant to prepare. Freedom from the law had the way prepared for it by the law itself, leading as it did to faith (how, see on ver. 23); but actual freedom came in only with faith. How?

Ver. 26 explains how (in connection with the aspect of the law as schoolmaster). By the fact that man through faith becomes a son of God. In this conception, however, we are not unduly to emphasize "son" as is commonly done, and to attribute to it the sense of free, son, come to majority, who therefore no longer stands, as a παῖς, under the παιδαγωγός. No doubt the "son of God" is also the one of full age, and therefore free; but Paul, instead of the bare notion of majority, substitutes at once a higher, theological idea, that of the Child of God. Whoever now stands to God in the relation of child, can no longer remain under the law, that schoolmaster, whose threats of the wrath of God awaken slavish fear.*—Πάντες=**all** without distinction. This word is meant to emphasize strongly the power of faith. Whoever he be that has it, becomes a son of God and free from the schoolmaster, therefore you also are free. "You" writes Paul of set purpose, having before (ver. 25) spoken only of the Jewish Christians as those who had previously been under the schoolmaster. But now: You all, even the Gentile Christians, all you who are become believers,—that it might come into no one's mind, to place himself, of his own accord, under the schoolmaster, the law.—Paul says designedly **in Christ Jesus** instead of a genitive immediately depending on **faith** because he wishes to predicate of Christians that they are in Christ Jesus. For he proves that they are sons of God, from their putting on Christ, ver 27.

Ver. 27. The demonstrative force here appears to be simply in this, that Christ was God's Son (MEYER). WIESELER's objection that Son of God is not used in a similar sense to that in which υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ would be applied to Christ, because it is not used in the sense of a being begotten of God, is a strange one. Certainly that is not meant, but by this very putting on of Him who as begotten of God is God's Son, believers come into the relation of children to God, of course in the measure in which it is possible with them.—It is peculiar that Paul proves that all are the children of God through *faith* in Christ, immediately from the fact that they all have put on Christ by *baptism*, and so, without any intermediate step, puts Baptism in the place of Faith. Faith and Baptism, accordingly, are to him in a certain sense convertible ideas, that is, he does not conceive faith without baptism, or baptism without faith; he can therefore prove an effect of faith from an effect of baptism, and doubtless he speaks only to and of such as were not only baptized as well as believers, but with whom also the act of baptism was at the same time an act of faith.—The transition, however, from the "faith is Christ Jesus" to the **baptized into Christ** is easily intelligible in another view also. For nothing proves so clearly that any one has become a Son of God, as that he has put on Christ, and this takes place through the "being baptized into Christ" in a way that is also objective, and therefore undeniable.* On the other hand, his reference to baptism is of course only secondary; he does not as yet mention it in ver. 26, because, according to the connection he is there concerned directly with the effect of faith.

The full import of **put on Christ** is not developed, yet one thing at least is said, and that is primarily the most important—it involves the having become a son of God. It is not immediately=the putting on of "the new man." For the discussion here respects not the ethical quality of the act, but the relation to God involved in it; it is by justification and the relation of children to God given therewith and not by the subsequent sanctification, that we become free from the pedagogy of the law; the filial relation to God does not result from the putting on of the new man, but the reverse. On the other hand, in becoming a son of God, a man naturally has come into an inner relation to Christ, into communion with Him. This inner relation to Christ, in which we invest ourselves with Him, must then without fail lead to this result, that Christ becomes in us the principle of a new life, and we become inwardly transformed. This result is the more certain in that the entrance into relation with Him is so entirely real, through the act of baptism. One cannot *enter* into such inward relation with Christ without also experiencing this inward transfor-

---

*[In ver. 25, the article is omitted before παιδαγωγόν, as if to imply, under any schoolmaster, *unter Pädagogengewalt* (MEYER). Still as MEYER himself suggests, the emphasis must be laid on θεοῦ, "sons *of God;*" therefore not in the old pedagogic bondage.—R.]

*[ALFORD says "Observe here how boldly and broadly St. Paul asserts the effect of Baptism on all the baptized." WORDSWORTH also at some length presses the objective grace of this rite. But surely there is as much and more reason for pressing "by faith in Christ Jesus" (ver. 26). Clearly the primary truth is "ye are all sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" the thought of ver. 27 is secondary. Where there is baptism and no sonship by *faith*, the question is an open one, as far as this passage is concerned, whether there has been any such "effect of baptism." See DOCTRINAL NOTES, 3.—R.]

mation, at least in its principle. The admonition Rom. xiii, 14: "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ," may therefore be understood in the sense of an admonition to a corresponding ethical work=to a becoming like Him through our work.—All are children of God by faith (πάντες, ver. 26; ὅσοι, ver. 27). This Paul carries out in the concrete in ver. 28.

Ver. 28. **There is neither Jew nor Greek.**—All these natural antitheses do not come into account in this relation,=if one only believes on Christ, he is a son of God, let him be what else he may. This is tersely expressed at the end of the verse by **for ye all are one in Christ Jesus.**—For this, according to the connection, can mean nothing else than: these distinctions, in a certain sense, antagonisms, do not, as respects being in Christ, come into consideration. All who are in Christ Jesus, are in the same degree "sons of God," how different soever they may be in other relations, that is, they are all, (ἕν) one and the same. Paul, however, goes somewhat farther yet, and by using εἷς, says that they are capable of being regarded all together, as one (moral) person.—Here too, we are not to think, at least directly, of "the new man" as if the "one new man" were meant.—Why now precisely *this* concrete explication of the "all" in ver. 26? The connection shows that the Apostle's first concern is to represent the antagonism of Jews and Gentiles as done away in Christ; for by the law this antagonism especially was maintained, and was therefore removed by the falling away of the law. And, on the other hand, the abrogation of the law could not be maintained in full earnest unless that antagonism were regarded as removed. But in order to make this "all" more vivid, or to place in still stronger light the power and meaning of faith in Christ, he adjoins yet other antitheses, and remarks that they too, in the new relation, are no longer reckoned of account; the slave also is through "being in Christ" a "son of God" as well as the freeman, and it is the same with sex. In this also, he appears to have the law still in mind. For these antitheses were maintained by the law; at least the law spoke sometimes of slaves, sometimes of freemen, sometimes of men, sometimes of women, and gave in respect to one class, ordinances which were not in force for another, while in view of faith in Christ, or of baptism in Christ's name—these antitheses fell entirely away. [There is a slight change of construction in the last antithesis. "The alterable social distinctions are contrasted by οὐδέ, the unalterable natural one is expressed by καί. The latter distinction is specially applicable as against the Jews insisting on their own spiritual privileges, and on the perpetual obligation of *circumcision*."—Wordsworth. Of this there may be a hint in the use of υἱοί, "sons," not "children," as E. V. The other sex have now the same privilege once belonging to "sons" alone. "Ἄρσεν and θῆλυ, generalized by the neuter, as being the only gender which will express both" (Alford).—R.]

Ver. 29. **But if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed.**—Because Christ Himself is Abraham's seed (vers. 16, 19), and those that are His participate in His status.—**Heirs according to the promise**—for it was to Abraham and his seed that the promise was given, therefore=the promise goes then for you also into fulfilment. On the other hand it needs no proof that those who are Christ's (because they are heirs by virtue of *this fact*, that they are Christ's) are heirs in the way of the promise of grace, not of works.

[Ellicott: "The declaration of ver. 7, is now at length substantiated and expanded by twenty-two verses of the deepest, most varied, and most comprehensive reasoning that exists in the whole compass of the great Apostle's writings."—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The Law and the Covenant.* Three points respecting the law are treated of in this section: *a*) the difference between the law and the covenant of promise; *b*) the inner relation of the law to the covenant as the means of preparation for the faith which receives the promised inheritance; *c*) the liberation from the law on the entrance of faith. Upon the first two points we have little more to say in addition to what has been already said in the Exeg. Notes.

a. The difference between the Law and the Covenant of Promise. The law was not only given much later (ver. 17), but had also an entirely different character from the covenant of promise made with Abraham, and is not therefore to be regarded as a sort of renewal of that first covenant. The revelation of God to the patriarchs was essentially a different one from the subsequent one at the giving of the law on Sinai. In the first God gave pure, free promises of grace for faith; in the second He also, it is true, gave promises, but imposed as a condition of their fulfilment, the observance of a complex system of law. Or, primarily, the whole sinful people were placed under a constitution of law, and to this promises were attached, but only in the case of obedience; in the case of disobedience, there were threatenings, quite as distinct. To this corresponded the entirely different way in which the law was brought in—in the formal way of a compact concluded through a third party, a mediator, where both sides make engagements, and take on themselves obligations. By this was indicated a separation of God and His people, and it was therefore not the *normal* relation of God to His people, the one corresponding to the nature of God, but only a relation induced by the circumstances, especially by the transgressions of the people at the time; from the beginning, therefore, it pointed beyond itself, but was, no doubt, for a certain time the proper one, adapted to prepare for the relation of grace between God and His people that had been introduced by His dealings with the patriarchs.

b. The inner relation of the Law to the Covenant as the means of preparation for the faith which receives the promised inheritance. Respecting the second point we give here only the apt remarks of Rieger (although his interpretation of ver. 22 is in itself incorrect): The attestation of God, written down and publicly promulgated in the law, has so taken hold of us and all our doing and leaving undone, that no denying, palliating, justifying of ourselves can any longer avail anything, but we must give ourselves up guilty and

prisoners under the curse denounced against every transgression; and through this captivity under the law, become pliant and ready for faith on the promise, as afterwards for coming humbly to the cross of Christ preached in the gospel, and thus seizing the only way of escape left remaining to us. The law, then, by its confining me under sin, so far from having the will or power to close against me the access to grace, on the contrary drives me into a strait, in which I am most apt to find and lay hold on the only means of escape. Deluding hiding places of the caves of sin, it indeed closes; but the appointed fleeing to the wounds that have atoned for me it furthers, rather than hinders. In brief: the promise ratifies to man everything, the law comes between and denies him all. Thereupon it is thought, God is against Himself, that must be allowed; but at last it turns out, that the law itself has had to help to this end, namely, that faith and the promise should have the victory. Christ is the law's honor, end, and fulfilment.

c. The liberation from the Law on the entrance of faith. Christ is the law's honor, that is, what honors the law is precisely this, that it leads to Christ. But at the same time and on this very account is He the law's *end and fulfilment.* The end of the law, for this beyond question is the intention of the whole Epistle, to demonstrate that Christians are no longer under the law, and in ver. 25, this is expressly declared: now that faith is come, we are no longer under the schoolmaster; he has fulfilled his office.—This is, in the first instance, to be understood historically. With the coming of Christ the epoch of the law, when it exercised dominion, is past, and a new epoch has begun, that of faith on Christ. Hence, also, those who in this new epoch are added to the people of God, through faith in Christ, that is, the Gentiles, are no longer to be held subject to the law, as though faith were not sufficient for salvation.—But this is to be understood also more specially, in a subjective sense; the man who has attained to faith in Christ, is thereby no longer under the law, but may and ought to view himself as free therefrom, and to appropriate to himself the full consolation of God's grace, and to oppose it to all accusations of the law.

2. *The Law has still its use, and must be preached among Christians.* But if now from (*c*) it were inferred: The law then no longer concerns us, and ought not to be preached among Christians! this would be a false conclusion. A *usus justificatorius*, unquestionably, cannot be made of the law under any circumstances, and we must, with Paul, warn men against any such use; and to this extent the position of the Christian preacher, as respects the law, is a negative one. But such a *usus*, indeed, did not belong to the law in itself, according to its Divine intention (as Paul teaches us), even though it was actually so employed. What belonged to the law, was the *usus pædagogicus*, and that it has still, and so far it has a function even in this, the New Testament era. For although the epoch of the law as a historical preparation for redemption, ceased with the coming of Christ, and with that the epoch of faith began, yet in the individual the "coming of faith" is always at first inchoate, and in this respect it cannot be said that in the Christian era we simply admonish the soul to have faith in Christ, and lead it at once to the true source of justification. This may indeed take place, nor can it be disputed that there is such a thing as coming to faith in Christ at once. But its depth, its steadfastness, its true, full worth, this faith receives, now as ever, only through the service of the law. This must be held up before each man, and that distinctly and repeatedly, in order to bring him to the knowledge of his incapacity of fulfilling it, of the impossibility of attaining in this way to justification, and of the necessity of faith in Christ. Even the ceremonial part is applicable to this end, in order to make the value of its fulfilment in Christ the more plainly visible. Naturally, however, the specially *ethical* precepts come into the foreground. (That, in the application of the law within the Christian sphere, these latter, of the whole complex system of the "Mosaic law," are most prominently in mind, and that, therefore, when we speak of the law as still having a use at the present time, the word is not to be taken in its full sense, is, of course, easily understood.)—In this holding up of the law, in its *usus pædagogicus*, there is, it is true, only an analogon of what took place in the actual epoch of the law; for the subjection under the law is renewed, so to speak. only in an ideal way. At most, it may be said to him who will not be persuaded of the impossibility of being justified by works of law: then make trial of the law awhile! But on no one may the law be actually imposed, for the sake of having it do its work on him, to prepare him for faith; and no one ought to impose it on himself to this end. And as to the "bondage under law" of the Christian Church before the Reformation, we may, it is true, view in it a permissive Providence of God, and therefore something that was salutary, but we are bound to stigmatize the fact in itself as indicating an entire misconception of the true character of Christianity.—Yet, if the law is to have its *usus pædagogicus*, an actual subjection under the law must take place, namely, through the medium of the conscience. Only where this "law written in their hearts" exercises its function (but not where there is a mere agitation of feeling or conviction of the intellect), is it possible for a vitally active faith to come into existence. Only for *conscientiæ perterrefactæ* do the consolations of the grace of the gospel in reality exist. And these exactions and threatenings of the law in the conscience are in turn essentially enlarged, more clearly defined and intensified by the positive law of God, so that in this sense it amounts to a complete "shutting up under the law." How long then this "keeping in word, shut up," *etc.*, is to last, how soon faith is to be revealed, and justification to be brought in, is reserved to God's secret counsel, who in the history of His people alone knew when the time was fulfilled. and who in the case of each soul also, alone knows it. To wish to continue "shut up under the law" would be perverse, for Christ is come, we must press through to Him, and in Him find consolation. But even when faith has been attained to, the *temptation* may come, to a retrogression "under the law," which must therefore be *overcome* with all appropriate means of strengthening faith. In this case then we are

to take a decidedly negative position with respect to the law, turning from it, suffering it not to terrify us, nor to expel Christ, and set Moses again in His place. Comp. also, on the whole subject, the admirable observations of LUTHER below, in the Homiletical remarks. This no doubt is the *usus*, which the law even since Christ's coming has retained. But this use manifests Christ more than ever as the End of the law: the law is only meant to drive us to Him. But Christ is also the Fulfiller of the law. The question therefore arises, whether the law have not another *usus* also, for the Christian. Upon this see below, in the remarks upon chap. v. 15 sq.*

3. *The significance and the blessing of Baptism.* Upon the idea of the "sons of God" see DOCTRINAL NOTE 7, on the following Section. Those are "sons of God," who believe on Christ, the more certainly so because they have received *Baptism*, and therewith have been baptized "unto Christ." For therewith they have "put on Christ" = have come into Christ = into Christ's relation to God = into the relation of the sons of God. Two things are implied in this passage. (1) Baptism is only a "putting on Christ," because joined with faith, it is therefore to be considered as such only when this connection really exists. That is: whoever positively does not believe on Christ, of him it is true, even if he chance to have received baptism outwardly, that he has not put on Christ. (Indeed, his being baptized could hardly be called "baptized into Christ.") On this ground, however, our practice of infant baptism remains legitimate. In the case of those, who do not yet believe when they are baptized, only because they are not yet capable of believing, but in whom there is just as little unbelief, or perverted faith in any thing else; in the case of children, who are *brought* by their believing parents to baptism, nothing certainly hinders us from assuming that they *in fact* "put on Christ." Let us consider only what this means. Not, to become a new man (see above, in the EXEG. NOTES), but in the first instance only to enter into the relation of children to God. For children certainly are not yet "under the law," and are not placed under the law (and consequently slavish fear of the Divine wrath and curse is out of the question), but are consciously placed by their parents under the promise of God in Jesus Christ. And if any significance at all is to be attributed to the parental care in this behalf, it must be assumed that an actual transfer under the promise takes place, where no positive opposition can exist. They receive from God the adoption of children, although as yet they do not use or comprehend it, that is, God comes into the relation of a Father to them, and accepts them as His children "in Christ Jesus," although as yet, they know it not. From this possession in fact, to the conscious use of it, those baptized then make the transition in the measure in which they themselves apprehend in faith the promise of God in Christ, and the most efficacious means for promoting this conscious apprehension in faith, is precisely the translation in fact into this relation to God, that has already taken place in baptism. What therefore with the adult, come to self-consciousness, is one act, namely, the communication of the blessing and the consciousness of having it, the translation into the adoption of children and the use and enjoyment of the same, is, with the child, divided. The possession is assured to it, in order that from the very beginning of self-consciousness, it may feel itself already in possession of the good, and may so much the more certainly make use of the same.* And yet—more nearly regarded—the distinction is not even so great as this, for with the adult also, the possession in fact of the adoption of children (the "putting on Christ") and the consciousness and enjoyment of it—are two things by no means always coincident, but the latter is lacking only too often, from the weakness, nay, want of faith, that may intervene, and then the first concern always is to apprehend the promises of God afresh in faith, or more exactly, by recalling to mind that we possess them in fact, to quicken anew faith, that is, the consciousness of the possession. (2) But it is to be observed, that on the other hand also, the power of effecting the putting on of Christ, and of making one a child of God is ascribed to faith only because it is joined with the being "baptized into Christ," and therefore also, we may further conclude, can be ascribed only to it, when it is joined therewith. So then the candidate's longing after faith inheres, as it were, in his baptism, and finds first through this its realization, so the converse is true: Faith not without Baptism! *i. e.*, not merely that baptism must be added to faith, to perfect and to seal it, &c., but although a beginning of faith, more, however, in the nature of an *inquiry* of the heart after the salvation in Christ, than any thing more definite must precede baptism,—faith itself comes to the *certainty: I* have salvation in Christ, that is, in fact, comes really to be faith, only upon the ground and in virtue of that acceptance of the individual on the part of God, and that giving of himself up to God, which takes place in the act of baptism. Only on the ground of baptism, therefore, does the actual putting on of Christ take place, and therewith the becoming a child of God. Unquestionably this is the blessing and the significance of baptism, that it would thus help us to faith, to certainty as to our personal state of grace in Christ, even though in special circumstances it is reserved to God to lead a man without baptism to the certainty of faith.

*[This third use of the law, viz.: as a guide to duty, is denied by Schmoller in form, but not in fact. That we must have a guide to our new life is evident enough. The only dispute is, as to whether we shall call it a *law* or not. Paul certainly does so in v. 14, vi. 2. And when this New Testament guide to duty is compared with the ethical precepts of the Mosaic law, it is found to be nothing else than the Decalogue itself, as Christ interpreted it, and as it was from the first designed to be understood. Compare the position of the law in the third part of the HEIDELBERG CATECHISM, *Of Thankfulness*, especially Questions 90, 91, 115.—R.]

*[Although any wider discussion of the subject of infant baptism would be inappropriate in this place, yet it must be added that any consistent pedo-baptist view must admit as much as Schmoller maintains here. The practice, however cherished from "custom or superstition," must inevitably fall into disuse (where there is no law compelling it), unless parents and children are brought to look at it in this light. Undoubtedly to my mind, it were better that it should fall into disuse, than be a mere public naming of a child, without any such delightful reality in it, as is here held. Of its efficacy as a means for promoting "the conscious apprehension of the promise of God in Christ," in after years, instances are still occurring, despite the prominence of "spasmodic" over "educational" Christianity in these days.—R.]

[CALVIN's remarks on ver. 27, present the middle ground of the Reformed Confession: "It is customary with Paul to treat of the Sacraments in two points of view. When he is dealing with hypocrites, in whom the mere symbol awakens pride, he then proclaims loudly the emptiness and worthlessness of the outward symbol, and denounces in strong terms, their foolish confidence. In such cases he contemplates not the ordinance of God, but the corruption of wicked men. When, on the other hand, he addresses believers, who make a proper use of the symbols, he then views them in connection with the truth —which they represent. In this case he makes no boast of any false splendor as belonging to the sacraments, but calls our attention to the actual fact represented by the outward ceremony. Thus, agreeably to the Divine appointment, the truth comes to be associated with the symbols.—The sacraments retain undiminished their nature and force; they present both to good and to bad men, the grace of God. No falsehood attaches to the promises which they hold out of the grace of the Holy Spirit. Believers receive what is offered; and if wicked men, by rejecting it, render the offer unprofitable to themselves, their conduct cannot destroy the faithfulness of God, or the true meaning of the sacrament. With strict propriety, then, does Paul, in addressing believers, say, that when they were baptized, they 'put on Christ.' In this way, the symbol and the Divine operation are kept distinct, and yet the meaning of the sacraments is manifest; so that they cannot be regarded as empty and trivial exhibitions."—R.]

4. "*Ye are all one in Christ Jesus.*" In this sentence there are two truths expressed, complimentary to each other, respecting the faith of Christians: *a. All* are one, that is, the natural differences, relative antitheses, which exist among men, place no limitations in the way of Christian faith. No one is hindered, by nationality or rank or sex, nor even by his religious belief, from becoming a Christian. Christianity is destined for absolutely all; as certainly as it is the specifically Divine, God-revealed religion; so on the other hand, this character of universality shows it to be the genuinely human religion, the religion destined for mankind as such.—Inasmuch as all can thus attain to faith in Christ, they can therewith, and this is the main thing, all attain also to the blessings contained therein, can all become God's children, all become heirs of the heavenly kingdom.—*b.* All, moreover, are also *one* in Christ. Inasmuch as the Christian faith embraces all, it also unites all, comprehends all in one great whole, and so first realizes in the full sense the idea of the unity of the human race, which by it is transformed into a great family of God. This it was meant to be, but is not of itself, not so much in consequence of the naturally established distinctions, as of the continual influence of (falsely uniting as well as) falsely sundering sin, to which so many false distinctions owe their first origin (as that of slaves and freemen), and which has given to those naturally existing a false tension, and turned them into sundering antagonisms.—This implies at the same time, that Christianity, while it unquestionably does away all artificially established distinctions, does not level down natural ones, grounded in the Divine order of creation (such as sex, age, and also nationality), although it will have them divested of all harshness and false exaggeration (comp. also ANACKER).

[The truth here set forth by the Apostle contains also the principle of true evangelical catholicity. As *all* are one, irrespective of the natural differences, relative antitheses, which previously existed; so all, who are "in Christ Jesus" are *one*, irrespective of the differences and antitheses, which remain after they become Christians. That through the influence of yet remaining sin, these antitheses become antagonisms, does not destroy the real unity, since all "in Christ Jesus" are at least tending towards assimilation to Him. This unity (or catholicity, as applied to the church) is something superior to external uniformity, whether of rite, order or mere theoretical creed. But, at the same time, it is something widely different from latitudinarianism. The latter has no positive basis, but this is the actual unity "in Christ Jesus," the real catholicity of those who are "one," not from outward constraint, or ecclesiastical regulations (however excellent), but from their position "in Christ Jesus," which necessarily involves oneness of life from Him, with Him and in Him. Such a catholicity will lead neither to attempts to unite the visible church by means of external uniformity, nor to less earnest holding fast to the truth as it is in Jesus. In the Catholic Church, as thus constituted, "neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision" (rites, polity, philosophic or speculative theology), "but a new creature." Gal. vi. 15.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL

Ver. 19. LUTHER:—Even as it does not make sense for a man to say: Money maketh no one righteous, therefore it is worth nothing, just as little does it profit to say: The law maketh no one righteous, therefore is it a useless thing. But a man should so acquaint himself with the matter, as to attribute to each particular thing its own functions, that suiteth and appertaineth thereto. [BUNYAN:—He that is dark as touching the scope, intents and nature of the law, is also dark as to the scope, nature and glory of the gospel.—R.]

LUTHER:—See here most evidently the evil consequence of transgressions. On account of these God was constrained to change His countenance towards His people, and could no longer simply give promises of grace. A separation had ensued, and a mediator must intervene, who yet could only throw a bridge over, but could not do away the schism; the people were placed under a law, that commanded, and promised also, it is true, and yet the promises could not receive their fulfilment.—Essentially this, even now, is always the result of transgressions. The law comes in, held up by the conscience, but this is only a mediator, which throws a bridge over, so that there is still a connection, but the separation cannot thus be taken away. —Yet as it was true of the people collectively, so is it true of the individual, that the law came indeed because of transgressions, but only *until*

the seed should come. It is to find its end when it has done its work; is then to yield again to the Divine grace in Christ. Christ also it is true was called a Mediator, for He also was to unite that which was severed. But He has really united it, and not merely thrown over a bridge. For He received from God and brought to the people not merely the law, but came for the people's sin and transgression "with His offering of Himself, and so removed the separation." Whereas when Moses interceded upon the Mount for his sinful people, his office of mediator approached, indeed, to that of Christ; but after the intercession, although it preserved the people from destruction, he still came back to them with new tables of the law, and with the glory on his countenance which the people feared, and which he must therefore hide. Entirely different is the glory of the new Covenant.

Ver. 21. Spener:—What God has ordained, is not at variance within itself, and therefore law and gospel are not at variance. Both agree together. But that we sometimes think they are contrary to one another, comes from our want of understanding. If we find therefore any two things in the Holy Scriptures that seem to contradict one another, we must yet believe otherwise concerning them, because both are spoken by God, and the defect is in us alone, that we cannot comprehend it.—[John Brown: —What a sad aptitude is there in our depraved nature to misapprehend the design of the gifts and works of God, and to pervert that to our destruction which was meant for our salvation, rendering such an exuberance of illustration necessary to prevent fatal mistake as to the purpose of "the law."—R.]

Berlenb. Bible:—The law cannot make living. It commands only: This shalt thou do, else thou art accursed. It does not give spiritual energies, but presupposes them. It cannot bring new Divine life into the dead heart of man. Therefore also it cannot justify. If it could do this, "then would be extolled and revealed to man, not God's grace, but rather men with their own power, merit, and work, which would be wholly opposite to the gospel, wherein God alone is recognized as righteous, but all men as false and powerless."

Ver. 22. The Scripture does not acknowledge in man the ability to help himself. It is the revelation of the general ruin, of the dominion of sin, over all men, showing how it began with the fall of the first man, and has extended itself over the whole. There follows from this the necessity of a redemption. This testimony of Scripture, still continued, should persuade *us* also, of the impossibility of attaining through works, that is, through our own strength, to justification, and of the necessity of entering, for that purpose, upon the way of faith. If the *Scripture* has *shut up* all under sin, it is an idle fancy, if thou thinkest thou canst nevertheless, in contradiction thereto, fulfil the law.—"That the promise," *etc.* Blessed purpose of the terrifying judgment: God would thereby only close up the false way, and therewith, as it were, procure Himself space for the redemption through Christ, and thus for the manifestation of His free grace agreeably to the covenant of promise.

Ver. 23. Luther:—The law is a prison, both bodily and spiritually. Bodily, it guards the ungodly outwardly, and restrains them so that they may not according to their will and pleasure practice all manner of villainy without fear. Then it shows us also spiritually our sin, terrifies and humbles us, in order that, when it has so terrified us, we may recognize our misery and perdition. And this is its true work or office, which it is appointed to discharge in us; yet so that it endure not forever.—The law with its custody is meant to serve our best good, namely, that when we are terrified thereby, grace and the forgiveness of sins may become to us so much the sweeter and more amiable, such as man can attain to by no works, but only through faith.—Whoever now is so well skilled, that in time of temptation he can bring together these two things, which are yet else of all things most opposite to one another, that is, whoever knows, when the law terrifies him most vehemently, that then the end of the law is at hand, and also the beginning of grace and faith, such a one knows rightly how to use the law. Know thou, that the law slays thee to this end, that thou mayest, through Christ, be made truly alive?—What has happened historically, at a certain point of time, since Christ has come, has done away the law, and brought freedom to light; the same happens day by day, spiritually, in every Christian man. For in such a one the matter is wont to take such a course, that now the time of law and the time of grace, ever one after the other, has room and place.—The law has its time, when it urges him, torments and plagues him, and brings him to feel his sin and acknowledge its greatness, to be afraid of death and God's judgment. And when it does this, it accomplishes its fitting and becoming work, which a Christian, while he yet lives in the flesh, feels more and oftener than he would fain feel it. But the time of grace is, when the heart, through the promise of Divine grace, is again helped up, so that it gains confidence through Christ towards God, and says: "Why then art thou cast down, O my soul, and why art thou disquieted in me?" Seest thou then nothing at all than merely law, sin, terror, mournfulness, despair, death, hell and the devil? Is there not also such a thing as grace, forgiveness of sins, righteousness, consolation, joy, peace, life, the kingdom of Heaven, God and Christ? We should with diligence learn to distinguish both manner of times, not with words only, but also in the heart, wherein they have their working. But this is above all things difficult. For although these two times, of law and grace, are widely different from each other, as concerns their unlike working, yet are they of all things *most closely joined together*, namely, in one heart. Yea, no one thing is to another so near as fear and faith, law and gospel, sin and grace. For so near are they to one another, that one consumes away and devours the other.—The law is *abused*, first, by all such as set their holiness in works, and indulge themselves in such dreams as that men can be made righteous by the law.—The law, secondly, is also abused by those that would set Christians wholly free therefrom, as the enthusiasts essayed to do, and who dream that Christian freedom is such a freedom as that every

one, after his own pleasure and presumptuous mind, may do what he will.—The law is abused, thirdly, by those that are terrified thereby, and yet understand not, that such terror should not endure longer than until they reach Christ. These, through such abuse of the law finally fall into despair, even as hypocrites by their abuse of the law, become proud and presumptuous. On the contrary, one can never highly enough estimate and value, what a dear, precious, and excellent thing it is to have the law, when it is rightly used.—[Such wrong use of the law is made by those who, appointed to lead children to Christ, continually din in their ears such false doctrine, such old legalism, as this: "My child, be good, do thus and so, or God will not love you." What wonder when parents and teachers make the first wrong use of the law above referred to, that the little ones, whom a better training would speedily bring to Jesus. waiting to receive them, make the third wrong use of the law, and are terrified by it. "Forbid them not" thus! Parents do not stand in the place of the law as a schoolmaster, but, as it were, in the place of God, the Father.—R.]

Ver. 24. [Burkitt:—Moses and the law is a rigid and severe schoolmaster, who by whips and threats requires an hard lesson of his scholars, whether able to learn it or not; but Christ and the gospel, is a mild and gentle teacher, who by sweet promises and good rewards, invite their scholars to duty, and guide and help them to do what of themselves they cannot do; by which means they love both their Master and their lesson, and rejoice when it is nearest to them to direct them in their studies—R.]

Luther:—If the law is done away, we are never henceforth under its tyranny, but are under Christ, and live in all security and joy, through Him who now reigns in us mildly and graciously by His Spirit. Therefore, if we could rightly apprehend Christ, the dear Saviour, this severe and wrathful schoolmaster would not dare to touch a hair of our heads. From this it follows, that believers, as concerns the conscience, are by all means free from the law; on this account the schoolmaster [*Zuchtmeister*] should not rule therein, *i. e.*, he should not affright, threaten, or take the conscience captive, and though he should undertake it, the conscience should not care for it, but should behold Christ on the cross, who through His death had freed us from the law and all its terrors. Nevertheless there is sin still remaining in the saints, whereby their conscience is accused and plagued. Yet Christ helps it up again through His daily, yea, continual drawing near. For like as Christ, when the time was fulfilled, came once upon earth, that He might redeem us from the insupportable burden and power of our schoolmaster, even so does He come every day, yea, every hour, to us spiritually, that we may grow and increase in faith and the knowledge of Him, and that the conscience may from day to day better and more certainly apprehend Him, and on the other hand, that the law of the flesh and of sin, the fear of death, and terror before God's wrath and judgment, and whatever else my unhappiness is, that the law is wont to bring with it, may continually grow weaker and weaker, and diminish more and more.

Ver. 26. [Calvin:—It would not be enough to say that we are no longer children, unless it were added that we are freemen; for in slaves age makes no alteration. The fact of our being children of God proves our freedom.—R.]—In Starke:—Even among God's children are many found that still are burdened with many weaknesses, as is witnessed by the example of the Galatians.

Ver. 27. Luther:—To put on Christ according to the gospel, means not, to put on the law and its righteousness, but means, by baptism to receive the unspeakable treasure, namely, forgiveness of sins, righteousness, peace, comfort, joy in the Holy Ghost, blessedness, life and Christ Himself with all that He is and has.—Starke:—The putting on of anything is such a union with that which we put on, that it becomes quite our own, that we therewith cover our nakedness, adorn ourselves, yea, it may even be, are superbly attired. Considering this matter, we may remember how our first parents, before their fall, needed no clothes to cover their nakedness, but after the fall sought them idly in fig-leaves, as an image of their own righteousness, in the place of which God made them other clothes of skins, as an image of the righteousness of Christ; for this is our beautiful garment, because it covers our nakedness, and protects us against the wrath of God, and adorns our soul.—O exceeding benefit, that we were baptized into the name of Jesus, even in our childhood! The remembrance of our baptism should be to us a continual assurance of participation in Christ and the kingdom of God; but not the less also give to us a continual impulse to all the faithfulness which the covenant of grace requires.—Believing Christians have in their daily putting on of apparel, especially when they put on new and clean garments, a beautiful figure, whereby they should bethink themselves, partly for comfort, of their legitimate nobility in Christ, partly of their bounded duty towards Him.

Ver. 28. [Burkitt:—Now since the coming of Christ there is no difference or discrimination between one nation and another, no regard to any national privilege, either of Jew or Gentile, no distinction of conditions either bond or free; or of sexes, either male or female; but circumcised or uncircumcised, we are all, one as good as another, in respect of outward privileges, or external advantages; but being sincere believers, we are all equally accepted of God in Christ. No external privilege or prerogative whatsoever, without faith in Christ, is any whit available to salvation; none are debarred from Christ, nor more nor better accepted with Him for any of these things.—R.]—Luther:—"For ye all are one in Christ Jesus." These are great and admirable words. Before the world and according to the order of the law, there is a very great distinction of persons, which should be most diligently maintained. For if the wife in the family would be husband, the son father, the scholar master, the servant lord, the subject ruler, what would come of it all? Truly a wild confusion, so that no one could know which was which.* But because Christ's kingdom is not a kingdom of the

* [*Dass Niemand wüsste wer Koch oder Keller wäre.*]

law, but of grace, there is also no distinction of persons therein. The Christ whom St. Peter and St. Paul, together with all the saints, have had, even the same I, thou, and all believers, also have, the same have all baptized children also. Therefore a Christianly believing conscience knows nothing at all of the law, but looks alone upon Christ, through whom it comes to the unspeakable glory of being God's child.—LANGE: —If all men are one in Christ, as respects the Divine benefits or blessings of salvation, so no less do the rules of life given, and the duties inculcated by Christ, apply to all, so that no one may except himself.

Ver. 29. STARKE:—The seed of Abraham is Christ with all His Christians, who cleave to Him in faith. He the Head, they as His members; He as the One through whom the blessing comes; they as His associates. Intimate and glorious union!

On vers. 15–22. (*The Epistle for the 13th Sunday after Trinity.*) HEUBNER:—The covenant of God with Abraham an everlasting covenant with the good. 1. Establishment, character of the same in itself: *a*) it is truly Divine, inviolable (ver. 15) and *b*) had reference as to its contents to all men and their redemption through Christ. 2. The continuance of the same even under the law (vers. 17–20): *a*) The law cannot abrogate the covenant of grace (vers. 17, 18). *b*) On the other hand the law is meant as a dispensation on account of sin to prepare the way for the perfect dispensation of the covenant (vers. 19, 20). 3. The perfecting of the same by Christianity: *a*) necessity of this covenant even according to the law (ver. 21), *b*) the condition of the same is faith in Christ (ver. 22).—The false and the right use of the law.—The dispensations of God for the salvation of men: Abraham, Moses, Christ. (The three stages of the economy of Salvation in their relation to each other.)—The unity of God with all the external difference of his revealed dispensations.—The one purpose of all the institutions of salvation.—Christ the consummation of all revelations.—GENZKEN: Promise and law: (1) Both given by God, (2) have both one divine purpose.—WESTERMEIER: The testament of our God: (1) its excellence, (2) its irrepealableness.—JOH. CHR. STARR: The use of the gospel for our salvation: whoever uses the same aright, regards it as a Testament, *a*) to which he adds nothing, because it is God's Testament (vers. 15 sq.), *b*) as a testament confirmed by the death of Christ (ver. 17), *c*) as a free irrevocable gift of grace (vers. 18–20), *d*) in which alone righteousness and life are to be sought.—In LISCO: The purpose of the law: (1) what it is not, (2) what it is.—God's covenant of promise an unchangeable one=not abrogated by the law: (1) the law might not abrogate it, because it had long before been established (vers. 15–18); (2) could not abrogate it, because it could not replace it=could not help to justification (vers. 21, 22).

Vers. 23–29. (*Epistle for New Year's Day.*)* HEUBNER: The happiest entrance into the new year: (1) When we grow out of sin and the law's constraint and through faith become children of God (ver. 23). (2) When we begin a new life after Christ's example, and become united in love (vers. 27, 28). (3) When we keep in mind the hope of one day celebrating in Heaven the eternal year of jubilee.—The free, courageous mind with which the Christian enters upon the new year.—WESTERMEIER: The precious New-year's gifts out of God's word, which this epistle offers: (1) Golden freedom; (2) A high rank; (3) A beautiful garment; (4) Peace and unity; (5) The best hopes for the future.—In LISCO: At the entrance upon a new year how important for all believers is the certainty that we are God's children.—SCHAZZER:—How happy our life in the new year will be, when it is a life in the new covenant! (1) What means it: to live in the new covenant? *a*) not to live without God; *b*) nor as in the old covenant =under the law; *c*) it means: life in the faith of the Son of God—in the adoption of God's children—in communion also with all the children of God. (2) Such a life is happy; for (*a*) it takes from us what makes us wretched: love of the world and the servile mind; (*b*) it gives us what makes us truly happy: the joyfulness of faith, the filial feeling, the blessing of Christian communion; (*c*) it promises us eternal life.—The blessing of being children of God consists (1) in the inward fear; (2) in the brotherly union; (3) in the promised inheritance.

CONARD: We are God's children: (1) this ought to give us repose; (2) impel us to holiness; (3) fill us with blessed hope.—HARLESS: Freedom in Christ: (1) freedom out of Christ; (2) actual slavery out of Christ; (3) the law and freedom in Christ.

Vers. 19–29. How is the law related to the covenant of promise? (1) It is essentially distinct therefrom, vers. 19, 20; (2) yet it is not in conflict with it, for it does not aim to justify (vers. 21, 22); (3) it is on the other hand advantageous for it, vers. 23, 24; (4) it must however recede before it (vers. 25 sq.)—Christ, (1) the law's honor=this is the law's honor, that it points to Christ; (2) the law's end.—The law points to Christ, but also ends in Christ [1, historically, 2, ethically].—Justification before God (1) comes into effect not without the law, (2) yet not through the law. Or (1) only through faith in Christ, (2) yet not without the law.

[Vers. 27, 29.—CHRYSOSTOM (in Turner):—Thus we say, with regard to friends, such a one has put on such a one, when we mean to describe great love and increasing harmony and union. For he who has clothed himself appears to be that with which he is clothed. Let Christ, therefore, always appear in us.—AUGUSTINE:—We having put on Christ are all Abraham's seed in Him, and we are Christ's members; we are one man in Him.—R.]

[Vers. 26–28. True freedom in Christ, hence true equality and true unity! How often are they sought by the world and even by the Church in some other way!—R.]

Of vers. 21–29 each one is suited to *immediate* homiletical application. Special suggestions are not needed.

*[In the Lutheran Church, etc., not in the Church of England.—R.]

e. In their condition of minority the sons of God were indeed held as servants—were under the law; but with the sending of the Son of God the time of majority, and therefore of the full position of sons and heirs, is come.

(CHAP. IV. 1–7.)

(The Epistle for the Sunday after Christmas.)

1 Now I say, *That* the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing [in nothing]
2 from a servant, though he be lord of all; But is under tutors and governors [guar-
3 dians and stewards][1] until the time appointed of the father. Even so we, when we
were children, were [or were kept][2] in bondage under the elements [στοιχεῖα, rudi-
4 ments][3] of the world: But when the fulness of the time was come [came], God sent
5 forth his Son, made [born][4] of a woman, made [born] under the law, To redeem
[That he might redeem][5] them that were under the law, that we might receive the
6 adoption of sons. And because ye are sons,[6] God hath [omit hath] sent forth the
7 Spirit of his Son into your [our][7] hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore [So
then, ὥστε] thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of
God through Christ [heir through God][8].

[1] Ver. 2.—[Ἐπιτρόπους. . . καὶ οἰκονόμους: the first referring to controllers of his person, *i. e.* "guardians," the latter, to managers of his property. *i. e.* "stewards." See Lightfoot.—R.]

[2] Ver. 3.—[Ἦμεν δεδουλωμένοι: the force of the perfect participle is more accurately expressed by "were kept in bondage."—R.]

[3] Ver. 3.—["Rudiments" is preferable to "elements," as bringing out more distinctly the *ethical* meaning. See EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[4] Ver. 4.—[Γενόμενον must be rendered alike in both cases. "Born," *natum*, is the interpretation now generally adopted. So Koppe, Schott, Meyer, and later English commentators.—R.]

[5] Ver. 5.—["It seems more exact to indicate the repeated ἵνα by the same form of translation" (Ellicott).—R.]

[6] Ver. 6.—[On the exact force of ὅτι κ. τ. λ, see EXEG. NOTES. "Sent forth" is the better rendering of the aorist.—R.]

[7] Ver. 6.—Elz. has ὑμῶν against preponderating authority. Altered to conform to the foregoing ἐστέ. [Ἡμῶν, ℵ. A. B. C. D. F, adopted by the best editors.—R.]

[8] Ver 7.—The reading κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ is with good reason approved by Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Meyer, Ellicott, Alford, Lightfoot.] ℵ. has it. "It is commended also by its comparative difficulty." The κληρονόμος θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ of the Rec. has arisen from a wish to lighten the difficulty, and is founded on Rom. viii. 17. So also the simple θεοῦ. The reading κληρονόμος alone is without any authority. [Wordsworth alone, among many recent English editors, adopts the longer reading.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

This section depends on the proposition which Paul announced at the close of the preceding one, that Christians are no longer under the νόμος παιδαγωγός, because they are sons of God, and heirs. It distinguishes, with a reference to Israel, which was God's son, and yet was under the law, a twofold condition of the sons of God, the condition of minority, when they were still kept in bondage, and the condition of majority, when that bondage ceased, and therewith the proper position of sons first began.

Ver. 1. **Now I say, that the heir, as long as he is a child** —"The heir"=the son, as the one who—by law and descent—is heir, even though he does not until afterwards come into possession of the property. He is **lord of all** =has the right thereto; nay, if the father is dead, he is actual possessor, only he cannot enjoy it, cannot assert his character as master, so long as he is under guardians as νήπιος, a child, [an infant, a minor. LIGHTFOOT: "The minor was legally in much the same position as the slave. He could perform no act, except through his legal representative. This responsible person, the guardian in the case of the minor, the master in case of the slave, who represents him to the state—was termed in Attic law κύριος. Prospectively, however, though not actually, the minor was κύριος πάντων, which the slave was not."—R.] The most natural reference is to a child placed under guardianship, whose father is dead, especially on account of the expression κύριος πάντων; and this is favored by the direct application to the son, of the term κληρονόμος, heir. Some interpreters, it is true, cite the expression: "until the time appointed of the father," as inconsistent with this, on the ground that the age of majority was *legally* determined; but this objection has too pedantic a character. [ALFORD: "The question, whether the *father* of the heir here is to be thought of as dead, or absent, or living and present, is in fact one of no importance; nor does it belong properly to the consideration of this passage. The fact is, the antitype breaks through the type, and disturbs it; as is the case wherever the idea of *inheritance* is spiritualized. The supposition in our text is, that a father has pre-ordained a time for his son and heir to come of age, and till that time, has subjected him to guardians and stewards. In the *type*, the reason might be absence, or decease, or even high office or intense occupation of the father; in the *antitype*, it is the Father's sovereign will; but the *circumstances* equally exist." So ELLICOTT and LIGHTFOOT.—R.]

Ver. 2. **Guardians and stewards.**—Επίτροπος also usually signifies guardian. Here, as =he who counsels the ward, defends him, and directs him. It is distinguished from οἰκονόμος =agent, a steward of the estate. The twofold expression is meant to bring out more strongly the idea of dependence.—**Until the time appointed of the father.**—Προθεσμία: "*tempus præstitutum*, appointed term, only here in N. T., but frequently in the classics, Philo and Josephus." MEYER. [Objection is made to the view that the definite time was appointed by the father (MEYER and others), since the term was fixed by statute in Roman law. Some suppose a reference to some exceptional legislation as respected the Galatians. But this difficulty arises only on the supposition that the father is conceived of as *dead*, which is but a supposition. Besides it is unnecessary, as implied above, to press the illustration.—R.]

Ver. 3. **Even so we.**—To be taken strictly= the Jewish Christians. They must be such as were "under the law" (ver. 5). [MEYER objects strongly to this limitation and with reason, urging 1) the sense of "rudiments of the world," 2) that in ver. 5, where the first clause evidently refers to the Jewish Christians alone, the second, taking up ἡμεῖς again, as evidently refers to Christians generally, since ver. 6 addresses such, and 3) that οὐκέτι (ver. 7) and τότε (ver. 8), applied to the Galatians, refer back to the servile condition. ALFORD, ELLICOTT and others admit only a secondary reference to the Gentile Christians. This is perhaps sufficiently satisfactory, but the whole context seems to refer it to Jews and Gentiles alike (LIGHTFOOT).—R.] **When we were children,** νήπιοι.—The pre-christian state is regarded as a childhood in relation to the Christian state of the same persons, only the Christian state then is regarded as ripe age (the comparison is differently applied 1 Cor. xiii. 11; Eph. iv. 13). In childhood a state of bondage existed [the perfect indicating a continued state.—R.]; the external position was that of a servant, not that of the free son. For we were yet ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, **under the rudiments of the world.**—For the different explanations which this difficult expression has received, see MEYER or WIESELER. According to my view the expression applies in any case only to Judaism, especially to the "law" (an Apostle Paul could not possibly comprehend Heathenism and Judaism under one idea, regarding them thus as virtually equivalent); and moreover στοιχεῖα, especially in view of iv. 9, is to be taken in any case in a spiritual sense=beginnings of religion, elementary wisdom; for only with that do the expressions ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχά, "weak and beggarly," agree. [Στοιχεῖα, originally the letters of the alphabet, as being set in rows. The question here is, has it a *physical* or an *ethical* reference. The fathers adopted the former view. The latter: "elementary teaching," is now generally received, and is supported by its simplicity, its accordance with the idea of "minor" running through the context, as well as by Col. ii. 8. See notes on that passage. Against the limitation to Judaism, see below.—R.]

Τοῦ κόσμου is either general=Mankind; "the collective human world is conceived as an individual subject, needing the Divine training, to which God, in its boyish age, lasting till the sending of Christ, gave the elementary instruction of the law" (WIESELER). It is true that the heathen world=this part of the κόσμος, had not these rudiments, but for that very reason does not here, where the object is the exposition of the Divine pedagogy, come into consideration. Or could "the world" be taken in a more specific sense, more fully characterizing the "rudiments" themselves=elements, which primarily belong only to the sphere of "the world," of the visible, the external, and hence themselves having the like character, themselves external (comp. LUTHER), opposed to the higher stage, as pneumatic or heavenly? Comp. τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν, Heb. ix. 1 (WIESELER). [The first view seems preferable, but without the limitation to Judaism, which grows out of Schmoller's view of "we." For there was a Divine pedagogy in heathenism also, under which most of these to whom Paul wrote "were kept in bondage." Lexically such a limitation is highly improbable. MEYER refers "world" to non-Christian humanity, and "the rudiments of the world" would then mean, not anti-Christian teachings, but the rudimentary training of non-Christian, ante-Christian humanity, including both Judaism and the strivings of heathenism, which may indeed have generally taken the form of external ceremonies, but which were alike propædeutic, the one containing besides an element absolutely good, absorbed in the gospel, the other, an element absolutely bad, antagonistic to the gospel. The Christian view of Ancient History, now generally received, strongly favors this interpretation. See CALVIN, MEYER, and comp. Col. ii. 8; also a thoughtful note of LIGHTFOOT, p. 170 sq., comparing the component parts of Judaism and heathenism.—R.]

Ver. 4, 5. **But when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son.**= When the measure of time was full: and this was full when the time appointed by God had elapsed. The time is conceived as a measure. [LIGHTFOOT: "It was 'the fulness of time.' *First:* in reference to the *giver.* The moment had arrived which God had ordained from the beginning and foretold by His prophets for Messiah's coming. This is implied in the comparison 'the time appointed of the Father.' *Secondly:* In reference to the *recipient.* The gospel was withheld until the world had arrived at mature age; law had worked out its educational purpose and now was superseded. This educational work had been twofold: 1. *Negative:* It was the purpose of all law, but especially of the Mosaic law, to deepen the conviction of sin and thus to show the inability of all existing systems to bring men near to God This idea which is so prominent in the Epistle to the Romans appears in the context here, vers. 19, 21. 2. *Positive:* The comparison of the child implies more than a negative effect. A moral and spiritual expansion, which rendered the world more capable of apprehending the gospel than it would have been at an earlier age, must be assumed, corresponding to the growth of the individual; since otherwise the metaphor would be robbed of more than half its meaning.—The primary re-

ference in all this is plainly to the Mosaic law; but the whole context shows that the Gentile converts of Galatia are also included, and that they too are regarded as having undergone an elementary discipline, up to a certain point analogous to that of the Jew."—R.]

Born of a woman.—Conveying no allusion to His miraculous conception, but simply an emphatic designation of the Incarnation, defining precisely "sent forth." The reality of the Incarnation is emphasized, in order, in the first place, to bring fully into view the humiliation which God imposed on His Son, and to make this contrast felt: He humbled Himself—we were exalted. But this humillation did not consist in the Incarnation alone, it was only the beginning; its full expression is found in **born under the law**, and the contrast becomes thereby still stronger: He was brought under bondage—we, into freedom. Yet of course the object is not merely to make the contrast sensible, but "born of a woman" and "under the law" is mentioned, because it was the means of attaining the end which was to be attained, namely, **that he might redeem**, *etc.*—*i. e.*, primarily and principally the being "born under the law" was this means, but this again was only possible through His really becoming man.—*Γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον*, probably simply=born under the law, not: brought under the law. The primary meaning of this is, in general, that by virtue of His Jewish birth, He, like every Israelite, was subordinated to the requirements of the law, and we are therefore to supplement "redeem them that were under the law" with *ἐκ τοῦ νόμου*, "from the law=that He might make those subjected to the law free from the law=that He might free them from the state of subjection under it, from their obligation to it, from the "bondage" just mentioned. The sense of "redeem" is given by the simple addition: *ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσ. κ. τ. λ.*,= might translate us from the position of servants into the free position of sons. Primarily, only this is implied in the words, and the expression therefore is not immediately convertible with the narrower, more defined one in iii. 13; although, indeed, if we look for the causal nexus between Christ's being born under the law and His redeeming those under the law, we shall be led back to the thought expressed iii. 13, as the connecting one, namely, that the one who stood "under the law" became by this law "a curse" =bore also the curse of this law, and thus freed the men who stood under the curse of this law from this curse of the law, and therewith from the law altogether, from dependence on it, since in the place of that dependence there now naturally came a believing self-surrendering to the Liberator. This filling out the thought by a reference to the death of Christ, gives moreover to "born of woman" also, its full significance; for only through this was death itself possible, as only through the being "born under the law" was it possible as a death under the curse of the law.

That we might receive the adoption of sons.—Properly the *position* of sons [*υἱοθεσία*] as opposed to the position of servants. Even "under the law" they were *in themselves υἱοί*, but as yet differing in nothing from servants; through Christ they first attained also to the *position* of sons, differed from servants. *Υἱοθεσία* here means then more exactly: the right of the free, major son. This may very well be designated simply as *υἱοθεσία*, since sonship *de facto* really begins with it, the son thereby first becomes properly a son.—That a sonship relatively to *God* is here treated of, is made apparent by the connection. [Schmoller evidently refers "we," in this clause, to Jewish Christians alone; but the objections of MEYER and others to such a limitation (see on ver. 3), apply with great force here. That it breaks the force of the Apostle's argument, and destroys the connection of the whole passage, to restrict it thus, is evident from the explanation into which Schmoller is forced in his remarks on the succeeding verse. It may be allowed that, in the previous clause, "those under the law" refers to Jewish Christians alone, but a wider reference of "we" to all Christians must be insisted upon.—R.]

Ver. 6. **And because ye are sons.**—Remarkable is the abrupt transition into the address to the Galatians, whereas what preceded applied to the Jewish Christians; for these were "those under the law," while the Galatians were, at all events, predominantly Gentile Christians. But through the sending of the Son the Gentiles also were to obtain the sonship with God, and they did actually obtain it through faith in Him. He can therefore naturally say to Gentile Christians also: Ye are sons,—and can appeal to the witness of the Spirit concerning this, which they have in themselves. And the discussion had properly direct reference to the Gentile Christians, the Galatians, to their freedom from the law; the remarks ver. 1 sq., were only as it were episodically woven in [?!], in order to explain the peculiar position of Israel under the law.—[Accepting the wider reference of "we" (ver. 6), we find here no "abrupt transition," but a change to the second person, in order to apply to the Galatians, what had been affirmed of all Christians. Of course this obviates the necessity of such an explanation of the connection, as Schmoller makes.—R.]—With this sentence Paul wishes to confirm to the Galatians, in a way indisputable to themselves, that they actually have the position of sons and no longer that of servants; they also (he says) have this, as well as the Jewish Christians, as certainly as the Spirit also utters His voice in them. The primary *purpose* of the sending of the Son, stopped with this *υἱοθεσία*. That the purpose has been *accomplished*, is shown first in this, the Spirit's witness of adoption. Ver. 7 therefore contains the simple conclusion from ver. 6: Accordingly thou art, etc. [It is a question whether *ὅτι* should be rendered "because," *quoniam*, or "that," *i. e.*, to show that ye are sons (ELLICOTT). Most commentators incline to the former view. ALFORD in his notes opposes MEYER, who adopted the latter view, which in his fourth edition, however, he characterizes as "harsh and unusual." Still the proof of sonship remains. He would not have sent the Spirit, if they had not been "sons."—R.]

God sent.—At the regeneration of each of the readers, or what may here be taken as identical, at their baptism. Yet naturally a continuous sending from that time forward, is not excluded but included. [The aorist is used as in

ver. 4, referring to a definite act. MEYER notes the similarity of form, as "a solemn expression of the objective (ver. 4) and subjective (ver. 5) certainty of salvation," and also as indicating doctrinally "the same personal relation of the Spirit, which God has sent from Himself as He did Christ."—R.]—**Spirit of His Son.**—A peculiar expression; not immediately convertible with the conception: spirit of sonship, but = the Spirit, which the Son of God has; plainly, moreover, which He has peculiarly as Son; hence, the Spirit, in which, with Him the consciousness of sonship relatively to God rests and expresses itself, and so = the Son of God's Spirit of sonship. God gives the very same Spirit into the hearts of those whom He has accepted as His sons for the sake of His Son Christ; and therewith they also attain to the consciousness of sons relatively to God, so that they cry: Abba, etc.—**Crying.**—This strong word, *κράζειν*, doubtless expresses, first and chiefly, the assurance and the strength of the persuasion, the full undoubting faith of having in God our Father; also, however, as resulting from this, the fervor with which the soul turns to this Father, yet without direct reference to a condition of trouble, in which a call is made for help.—**Abba, Father!**—"It is simplest to suppose that the juxtaposition of the two equivalent expressions is meant to emphasize more strongly the idea of Father." WIESELER. MEYER with less probability thinks, that Ἀββᾶ had become so settled and sacred a term, as an address to God in Christian prayer, that it had acquired the nature of a proper name, admitting thus the addition of the appellative ὁ πατήρ. The ancients found in it an intimation: *quod idem Spiritus fidei sit Judæorum et gentium.* [It seems best to regard this repetition as taken from a liturgical formula, which may have originated among the Hellenistic Jews, who retained the consecrated word "Abba," or among the Jews of Palestine, after they became acquainted with the Greek language. The latter theory best explains the expression as used Mark xiv. 36 (LIGHTFOOT). There may be a reason for retaining "Abba" in its affectionate character, "My Father" (ALFORD). And the repetition may contain the hint, which the Fathers, LUTHER, CALVIN and BENGEL find, of the union of Jew and Gentile in Christ. Certainly an advance from the "Abba" of childhood to the "Father" of maturity, on the part of the believer, is not implied, nor is there a reference "to the fact that a *freedman* might by addressing any one with the title Abba, prepare the way for adoption by him," since they are enabled thus to cry, "because ye *are* sons."—R.]

Ver. 7. **So then thou art.**—A progress in individualizing for a practical purpose; namely, to bring home fully to each one separately, what he possesses through Christ.—**No more a servant.**—This refers back to the being "in bondage under the rudiments of the world," and applies to the Jewish Christians in its full sense, and then to the Gentile Christians also, in this respect, that in consequence of the sending of the Son, the necessity of giving themselves up to be held in bondage "under the rudiments of the world" was done away for them also: that in Christ these have lost their force. [In the wider view of "we" (ver. 3) this explanation is unnecessary.—R.] In what special, still more wretched sense, they too were actually slaves, and so the state of servitude was abolished for them, appears immediately after in ver. 8.—**But a son.**—The contrast between "servant" and "son," as applied to the Jewish Christians, is limited to their being now in actual enjoyment of the son's privileges; as applied to Gentile Christians it is without restriction.—**And if a son, then an heir through God.**—"Through God" makes prominent that the one character, as well as the other, proceeds from grace, as opposed to all desert of works. Because a son (*sc.* of God), therefore according to the well-known hereditary right, also an heir, *sc.* of God. The controversy, whether Jewish or Roman right of inheritance is meant, may be called pedantic. Heir of God = to whom God's possession appertains, eternal life. [The briefer reading, διὰ θεοῦ, now generally adopted, is thus remarked upon by WINDISCHMANN: "It combines, on behalf of our race, the whole before-mentioned agency of the Blessed Trinity: the Father has sent the Son and the Spirit, the Son has freed us from the law, the Spirit has completed our sonship; and thus the redeemed are heirs through the Triune God Himself, not through the law, nor through fleshly descent."—R.]—This gives another basis for "heirs," iii. 29, and the train of argument thus reaches its conclusion.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The rudiments of the world.* Respecting the characterizing of the law as "rudiments of the world," comp. the remark of LUTHER: Learn from this, when it concerns the business of justification before God, to speak of the law most contemptuously, following the Apostle. But when we are not treating of how a man may become acceptable and righteous before God, we are to reckon the law most highly and honorably, and with St. Paul, to call it holy, righteous, good, spiritual, and divine, as indeed it truly is.—St. Paul is alone among all the Apostles, in speaking so scornfully as it may appear, of the law. The other Apostles make it not their wont, so to speak. Therefore ought every one, who will study in the Christian theology, to take careful note of this diverse manner in St. Paul's writings. He has been called by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself His chosen vessel, and therefore also He gave him an elect mouth, and a diverse way of speaking above the other Apostles, so that he, as chosen vessel [*Rüstzeug, lit.* weapon], might most firmly and most faithfully found the citadel of the faith, even the article which teaches how a man must become righteous before God, and might teach the same most perspicuously, and most clearly,

2. *Law and Old Testament.* "Law is not synonymous with Old Testament, gospel with New Testament; as if we could say: The law has been abrogated by the gospel, Christ is the end of the law, therefore for us Christians the Old Testament has no more validity. It is not so, but the Old Testament as well as the New, contains gospel promise of grace, and the New as well as the Old contains law. Only that in the Old Testament the law, the schoolmaster unto

Christ, prevails, the gospel, on the other hand, appears in the form of promise of the future salvation, and so is more veiled; but in the New Testament the gospel of the accomplished salvation strikes the key-note, and the law, as a threatening might, only opposes itself to the despisers of salvation, and is written in the hearts of believers. And since the gospel extends through the whole Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testament, every Christian must necessarily count the Old Testament also honorable and holy. It is true here also: What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." ANACKER.

3. *The fulness of the time.* For a full historical demonstration of Christ's having come in the fulness of time, see *e. g.*, ANACKER. [SCHAFF: *History of the Apostolic Church*, and *History of the Christian Church*, vol. I. "It was a great idea of Dionysius 'the little,' to date our era from the birth of the Saviour. Jesus Christ, the God-man, the prophet, priest, and king of mankind, is, in part, the centre and turning point not only of chronology, but of all history, and the key to all its mysteries. All history before His birth must be viewed as a preparation for His coming, and all history after His birth as a gradual diffusion of His spirit and establishment of His kingdom. He is 'the desire of all nations.' He appeared in the 'fulness of time,' when the process of preparation was finished, and the world's need of redemption fully disclosed."

"As Christianity is the reconciliation and union of God and man in and through Jesus Christ, the God-Man and Saviour, it must have been preceded by a two-fold process of preparation, an approach of God to man, and an approach of man to God.—In Judaism the true religion is prepared for man; in heathenism man is prepared for the true religion. There the divine substance is begotten; here the human form is moulded to receive it. Heathenism is the starry night, full of darkness and fear, but of mysterious presage also, and of anxious waiting for the dawn of day; Judaism, the dawn, full of the fresh hope and promise of the rising sun; both lose themselves in the sunlight of Christianity, and attest its claim to be the only true and the perfect religion for mankind."

"The way for Christianity was prepared on every side, positively and negatively, directly and indirectly, in theory and in practice, by truth and by error, by false belief and by unbelief—those hostile brothers, which yet cannot live apart—by Jewish religion, by Grecian culture, and by Roman conquest; by the vainly attempted amalgamation of Jewish and heathen thought, by the exposed impotence of natural civilization, philosophy, art and political power, by the decay of the old religions by the universal distraction and hopeless misery of the age, and by the yearnings of all earnest and noble souls for the unknown God. 'In the fulness of time,' when the fairest flowers of science and art had withered, and the world was on the verge of despair, the Virgin's Son was born to heal the infirmities of mankind. Christ entered a dying world as the author of a new and imperishable life."—R.]

4. *God sent His Son, born of a woman.* In these few words we have the sum of the second article [*i. e.*, of the Augsburg Confession]: "Jesus Christ, true God, born of the Father in eternity, and also true man, born of the Virgin Mary." ANACKER.—If the preëxistence of the Son does not follow of necessity from the expression: God *sent* Him, it follows so much the more necessarily from the added clause: "Born of a woman," *i. e.*, from the fact that this is predicated of the Son as something peculiar. Paul cannot have been thinking of a man, to whom the character of God's Son belonged only in some theocratic sense, who had been elevated to it by God: for why then the particularizing clause: born of a woman? It would be absolutely meaningless. It has a meaning only in the case of One, who in Himself was not one born of woman, who only became so, with whom this was something entirely peculiar. The peculiarity and noteworthiness of the fact, also, that the Son of God was born under the law, depended, in reality, upon this, that in His original state He had not human nature.—The supernatural conception, it is true, is by no means implied in the expression: born of a *woman*, in itself, as if *by this* the concurrence of the *man* were to be excluded. But if we take this expression together with "God sent His Son," we are almost necessarily constrained to assume another than the ordinary origin through the generative activity of the man, an immediate activity, instead, of the God who purposed to send the Son.—The Divine Sonship of Christ is one belonging to Him in Himself, essential to His nature, so essential, that even by being born of a woman, and under the law, it was not nullified. It is on this account entirely different from our Divine sonship: this is an acquired, a mediated one; mediated through God's Son Christ.—On the other hand in this passage the true humanity of Christ is most distinctly declared. He did not bring His body from Heaven, and did not pass with it through Mary *quasi per canalem*, nor did He merely assume a body like an angel. Either is excluded by the expression: born of a woman. And the tenor of the passage shows plainly that it is meant, not to declare His preexistent being (this we can infer only by reasoning back), but precisely His true humanity, that God sent Him in such wise that He caused Him to be born and be manifested as man; it was precisely this which made it an actual *sending*, fulfilling the promise. But on the other hand this Man=God's Son; for if not, the purpose would in this way have failed in accomplishment, since it was no other than His Son that God would send.

5. *Born under the Law.* By this is made prominent not the legal *obedience* which Christ rendered, or anything performed by Him, but something to which He subjected Himself, the *dependence* on the law, in which He was placed —according to the whole connection: a δουλοῦσθαι (comp. τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον), primarily dependence in general, and then as the culmination of it, the curse of the law, to which He subjected Himself. This passage therefore is no proof of the "active obedience of Christ," as it is termed. Christ, it is true, was in such a sense under the the law that He observed it; He did not resist it; He was content with this dependence, and fulfilled the requirements of the law. But it is inappropriate to designate the *obedience*, which

Christ indeed rendered in fullest measure towards His Father, as fulfilment of the law, and to designate the (active) fulfilment of the law as that which was great and meritorious in Christ. Christ's obedience was an essentially free obedience of a child towards the Father, and thus far surpassing a bare *law*-obedience.—On the other hand, the statement of doctrinal theology, which in many quarters causes scandal, that Christ was *in Himself* not subject to the law, is *in itself* not incorrect. Only we must then take law in the entirely definite Biblical sense. The γενέσθαι ὑπὸ νόμον which was added because of transgressions, was of course something in itself wholly inadequate to His sinless being, wholly obedient as it was to God; He stood, as concerned Himself, in the Son's relation to God, not in the servant's relation, was no minor, needed no παιδαγωγός. This γεν. ὑπὸ νόμον, therefore, was something in itself foreign to Him, imposed upon Him, and undertaken by Him, *for the definite purpose* of the redemption of those under the law. But He was the first one "under the law" who yet was sinless, obedient to God, and this availed to the good of the men who were under the law

6. *Adoption and the consciousness of it.* From the attainment of the filial relation to God [*Gottes-Kindschaft*] Paul distinguishes again the certainty of the same, so to speak, the conscious exercise of the privilege of children. Agreeably to this he distinguishes a twofold sending: the sending of the Son into the world and the sending of the Spirit of the Son into human hearts. On the first is grounded the *attainment* of the adoption of God's children, inasmuch as the sending of the Son led to the ransoming of those under the law. This is the objective side. Yet this hardly denotes merely the redemptive act of Christ, but includes doubtless, even at this point, faith in this act, as without this faith there is not an actual adoption, a being a son (comp. ὅτι δέ ἐ σ τ ε υἱοί). But to this is yet added the sending of the Spirit of the Son into the hearts of the redeemed, or more specifically: His crying Abba in the heart. Primarily this serves for the sealing and making sure of the now established filial right (comp. Rom. viii. 16). Yet it is not bare assurance that is wanted, but the exercise, the use of the right; and this first becomes possible by receiving the Spirit of Sonship, exclaiming Abba. "Should we wish to do it of our own desire and folly (namely, use such an heartily filial address to God), the word would die upon our lips; for *we* cannot make God our Father, only He Himself can do it." It is this Spirit of adoption Himself, says Paul here, that cries Abba in us, of course, by uniting Himself with the spirit of the suppliant, and forming in it the language of filial address to God. Therefore Rom. viii. 15: *We* cry Abba *by* this Spirit.

Paul distinguishes, as has been said, two stages, but yet plainly not in such a sense as if the first were something complete within itself, and the second added to it, as something distinct, but whoever is "son" receives *eo ipso* this Spirit, and if he did not receive it, the Apostle would not predicate the being a son of him. The receiving of this Spirit is for him, and is meant to be for the readers (on which account he alludes to it), the criterion of having become a "son of God." He cannot conceive the being a son without this Spirit in the heart exclaiming Abba. Therefore he affirms it at once and in reference to all: "Because ye are sons, God sent forth," etc. The same faith which translates us into the position of children, opens also the access to this Spirit. Yet of course this receiving of the Spirit of sons or children, is again somewhat successive, and Paul does not mean to say that this crying Abba takes place always with uniform strength and joyfulness; he will not deny that there come times of spiritual conflict; he only expresses what is normal.

7. *Son, not servant.* The idea of Divine sonship is a twofold idea, for the υἱὸς θεοῦ is first (υἱὸς) θ ε ο ῦ and then υ ἱ ὸ ς (θεοῦ). In Rom. viii. 14 sq., the previous context shows the former to be the main idea, for "being a son of God" is opposed to living "after the flesh," and is defined by "led by the Spirit of God." In this passage the essential idea is the second one: the Son of God is *son* and no longer *servant* (with which we may also supply "of God"), or the filial relation of the Christian to God, as it is brought into effect by Christ, involves the idea of religious maturity. The Christian has through his faith come religiously to majority; he no longer stands to God in the relation of the minor son, still kept in bondage. This latter relation of man to God is also one in itself possible and relatively admissible. God Himself placed man in it by the law (ver. 3); Israel itself stood by God's appointment in the relation to God of religious minority, was as yet "kept in bondage under the rudiments of the world." This was at that time what was fitting and wholesome for the people of God. (And in a certain sense the man who as yet knows nothing of Christ, is, even now, in this relation to God, is the unfreed minor, kept in by legal restraints, at least by the inward law of the conscience. It is true this law is a far more imperfect one than the positive law of God. Therefore the natural man without Christ is far more a δοῦλος than Israel was—a δοῦλος rather to the σάρξ or the φύσει μὴ ὄντες θεοί than to God; and there is needed at first a special activity directed to the awakening of the conscience. See below.) It is otherwise with the Christian; he has gained through faith in Christ, or rather through the Spirit of Christ, the position towards God of the free major son: this position, because established through Christ, has its direct analogy in the relation of Christ to His Father. It is true there is in this no independent dignity [*Selbstherrlichkeit*]; but it is not so much that this is forbidden him, as that he himself is the farthest possible from wishing it, recognizing in it, as he does, an illusive image, knowing that thereby he would in truth lose his freedom, that true freedom consists in this very obedience of love towards God, in speaking nothing else than what He teaches, in doing nothing else than what He points out Thus, although not living to himself, he is yet truly free, even towards God, as one of full age; is, *sui juris*, independent. For his conduct is not prescribed to him in legal injunctions, regulating even the outward life, and seeking in

this way to conform the inner life to God's will; he recognizes the "living to God" as his very element, the condition of his happiness. His obedience is not merely an obedience of law towards a ruler, but a life in trustful love to Him who is recognized as Father and sealed through the Spirit.

But especially does the maturity of the Christian consist in this, that he is *heir*, in possession of the paternal *estate*. For thus the minor is distinguished from the major son; for the former the inheritance is as yet administered by others, and he himself is not yet in enjoyment of it, but only, it may be, from time to time, receives out of it what is necessary for him, and on the other hand, may, on occasion, be kept in straits, or even subjected to punishment. So with man under the law; as he first sees in God One who commands and strictly regulates life, so also he sees in Him one who bestows good only according to desert, and who just as certainly, where punishment is deserved (as is more often the case), inflicts punishment, and instead of a blessing communicates a curse. It is otherwise with the son of full age and with the Christian. He is heir, is in possession and enjoyment of the paternal estate. This actual enjoyment of the inheritance he possesses in the first instance in justification and the state of grace connected therewith. As the major son freely disposes of the paternal estate, so also the Christian, in faith freely applies himself, as it were, when he will and as oft as he will, to his Father's treasure, and takes from it whatever he desires. Only this possession and enjoyment of his is, as it were, still embarrassed by the "sufferings of this present time," and the glory of the inheritance is still "to be revealed" (Rom. viii. 17, 18), as indeed the major son also, who has come into possession of the paternal estate, has still to struggle with many inconveniences, and so cannot as yet give himself up to the undisturbed enjoyment of his estate, and yet is none the less the free son, of full age, and by no means any longer in his minority. From this the simple inference is: (1) That as the Christian may not deprive himself of his position as Christian, if he would not incur the reproach in ver. 9, so also he may not be robbed of this rank or denied it, he may not be again placed under guardianship, and thus reduced from one of full age to a minor again, that therefore in particular the law may not be again imposed upon him, and his relation to God represented as conditioned by that; (2) that a Christian church, which does not regard her members as mature children of God, and train them to be such, but which instead retains them under the guardianship of the Divine law, or, more than that, of self-devised human ordinances, and accords to them only such a share in the benefits of Divine grace as suits her own discretion, if indeed, she does not wholly conceal them and set an inheritance invented by herself in their place—that such a Christian church misapprehends her most essential character (for Christ was no new lawgiver), and that therefore the Romish church, which does this, incurs this reproach, and that the evangelical church would incur the like reproach, so far as she imitated her in this, in a supposed pedagogic interest, or for the sake of discipline and order.* She has simply to be God's almoner by offering the means of grace which excite and strengthen faith, as the condition of adoption as God's children, and what she ordains can lawfully have no other end than directly or indirectly to further such beneficence. True, individually as well as historically, the state of maturity, in the child of God, is preceded by that of immaturity; for just so certainly as a Christian is in the former state, just so certainly is he there no otherwise than through actual heart-faith. But the true way, that agreeable to the Divine order in such a case, is (according to remarks on the foregoing section) to hold up the law for this end and this only, that the man's conscience and with it the knowledge of sin may be awakened, that the law may prove itself in him also "a schoolmaster unto Christ." Now this comes to pass only through the preaching of the word of God in its completeness, inasmuch as thereby the law also is set forth, but now, of course, only with the intention of leading to the Gospel and therewith to the condition of spiritual maturity.

8. *Old Testament believers not of full age.*—As respects Christians the believers of the old covenant were accordingly not yet in the full sense "sons of God," *i. e.*, "major sons." "But how were then the holy prophets, the great heroes, the upright men of God, who lived from Moses until Christ, minor children, that must be kept under the figurative rudiments of divine instruction as under tutors and governors? Doubtless in a certain sense they were. It is true that in much they have surpassed us; but what was spiritual, heavenly, eternally permanent in the kingdom of God, what Paul ever calls 'a mystery,' was not revealed to them so plainly as to us" (Roos). In order to judge correctly, we must however, with the Apostle himself, distinguish the period before the law from that under the law. For example, the patriarchs, although in another respect also children, stood in immediate intercourse with God, were not in the position of servants. On the other hand there certainly was also in the believers under the law, in proportion as the promise of the new covenant was living in them, *e. g.*, in the prophets, an anticipation, in a certain sense, of the position of major sons of God, although rather in some single moments of elevation.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 2. STARKE:—Human ordinances, which are directed to the well-being of the commonwealth, are in themselves in no wise contrary to the Divine law.—When the Prince of Wales in his childhood once refused obedience to his governess, appealing to his dignity as heir to the throne, Prince Albert brought the Bible, read him this passage, and chastised him.

Ver. 3. HEUBNER:—The human race has had authorized and unauthorized guardians. Moses was authorized, for God had appointed him, on

* [There is doubtless a polemical reference in these statements of Schmoller, of no special interest to the American reader. It need only be suggested that Lutheran *antinomism* sometimes seems (but only seems, it may be conceded) to verge on *antinomianism*.—R.]

the other hand the Pope and Mohammed without authority have endeavored to bring back the race, now free and of full age, to minority again. The authority of revelation does not retain us in minority; for the faith which it requires is no blind second-hand piety, but first makes us truly free from all that darkens and binds.—SPENER:—God has His wise distribution of the measure of grace at various times, with which we must be content and learn to accommodate ourselves thereto. He has also His holy order, according to which He leads His children in conversion from the law into grace.—BERLENBER. BIBLE:—This guardianship was designed only for minors; hence it is all wrong when Christians allow themselves to be brought into bondage again under ordinances, which are urged upon souls as good and necessary to salvation, and made a burden, beyond and without God's Word and revealed will, which therefore proceed not from nor are approved of Christ and His Spirit. O how many, that otherwise have a good degree of knowledge and personal piety, are in a pitiable bondage under such things! Either they are things which are counted as belonging to outward worship, or which should otherwise serve to make people pious. Now it is not indeed to be denied that some incitements in themselves innocent may help beginners somewhat. But so soon however as a rule and necessity, or it may be even a holiness, is make out of it, it is a yoke. But the main cause why such ordinances of men are a slavery of souls is, because men commonly therein seek and exalt themselves. Our crafty nature seeks with its tricks to maintain itself in its false life, and conceals itself behind outward observances and human usages. Meanwhile it secretly carries on its sins, as before, and will not drown and die in the death of Christ.—It is enough to suffer that other hard yoke, which presses the man at his first conversion. The law of God itself knows how to press him hard enough then, with its righteous judgments and requirements. Matters go laboriously and wretchedly enough with a young believer.

Vers. 4, 5. For this fulness of the time the fathers and all believers in the Old Testament waited with great pangs and earnestness. Not less longingly then, even now, must he wait and look for this Deliverer, who feels his imprisonment. For the fulness of the time, which began with Jesus' birth, continues ever from then on through all times, our own times among them.—As this took place as to the outward work, so does it now come to pass as to the inward, since the revelation of the Son breaks forth at the time which the Lord has decreed, and His government takes the upper hand in order to bring matters to that stage, to which under the drawing of the Father they could not attain. If thou therefore spyest in thyself a mighty drawing towards faith and hungering after Jesus, take heed that thou neglect it not. For this is even the fulness of thy time, when thy Saviour is about to be sent into thy heart by the Father. In the same hour learn thou to watch and pray, and to forget all else, that thou mayst win thy freedom.

LUTHER:—Hear thou, O law, thou hast no right nor might over me; therefore I concern myself nothing, that thou accusest and condemnest me long and much; for I believe on Jesus Christ, God's Son, whom God the Father hath sent into this world, that He might redeem us poor, wretched sinners, who were in bondage under the law's constraint and tyranny.—Christ hath redeemed us, in that He was made under the law. When He came, He found all of us together guarded and shut up under the law. What did He then? Because He is God's Son and Lord over the law, the law hath no right nor power over Him, nor can it accuse Him. Now, although He was not under the law, yea, was its Lord, He nevertheless willingly subjected Himself to the law. Christ incurred no debt to the law, yet did the law nevertheless behave itself towards this innocent, holy One, &c., even so as towards us, yea, it raged much more and more cruelly against Him than it is wont to do against us men. For it accused Him as if He were the very worst blasphemer and mover of sedition, and pronounced that He was guilty of all the sins of the whole world, and finally it condemned Him by its sentence to death, and moreover to the most shameful of all deaths on the cross.—Because now the law has dealt so cruelly against its God, Christ now appears against the law, and speaks on this wise: Good mistress Law, you are indeed a mighty invincible empress and tyrant over the whole race of man, and have moreover a right thereto; but what have I done to you, that you have so cruelly and contumeliously accused and condemned me the Innocent? Then must the law, because it can by no means answer for this, nor excuse itself, suffer for it in turn, and allow itself also to be condemned and strangled, so that it may therefore retain no right, nor power, not alone against Christ, whom it hath so injuriously assailed, but also against all who believe on Him.—So has Christ now through this His victory chased the law away out of our conscience in such manner that it can no more put us to shame before God. This one thing it does yet, it still continues to reveal sin to accuse and terrify us; but the conscience lays hold against it of these words of the apostle: Christ hath redeemed us from the law, maintains itself thereon by faith and comforts itself therewith. Yea, so proud and courageous moreover does it become in the Holy Ghost, that it dares bid defiance to the law, and say: I care little for all thy threatening. For the victory, which Christ hath won of thee, He hath bestowed upon us; therefore we are now become free of the law unto eternity, if so be we abide in Christ. Therefore let there be praise and thanks to our dear God, who hath given us such victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

[Vers. 4, 5. ROBERT HALL:—(1) The mission of Jesus Christ, and the manner in which He manifested Himself. The Son of God, "made of a woman, made under the law." (2) The design of His mission; "to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." (3) The fitness of that season which God in His infinite wisdom appointed for this purpose.—It was a most favorable time to prevent imposture in matter of fact; an age the furthest removed from credulity, an age of skepticism. The Infinite wisdom saw fit to select this time to silence forever the vain babblings of philosophy, to "destroy the wisdom of the wise."—Because

the fulness of the time was come, the event here referred to was the most important that had ever distinguished the annals of the world. The epoch will arrive when this world will be thought of as nothing, but as it has furnished a stage for the "manifestation of the Son of God."—R.]

Ver. 6. LUTHER:—When we stand in the midst and deepest in the terrors of the law, when sin as it were thunders over us, death makes us tremble and quake, the devil roars most cruelly, then begins the Holy Ghost to cry: Abba, dear Father! And this, His cry, is much mightier than the law's, sin's, death's, and the devil's cry, let it sound ever so loud and hideously, it breaks and presses with all might through the clouds and the heavens, comes before God's ears, and is heard, &c.—Although I am on all sides in great terrors and distresses, and it seems as if I, Lord, were wholly and utterly forsaken by thee, yet am I nevertheless child, thou, Father, for Christ's sake. I am to thee dear and pleasant for the Beloved's sake. But for man in his heart to be able to utter the little word "Father" in time of temptation in true earnestness, there needs such a deep skill thereto, as truly neither Cicero, nor Demosthenes, nor any other accomplished orator has had; yea, should they even melt together all their skill in one heap it were not yet possible for them perfectly to utter forth what is meant by the Holy Ghost in the single word "Father" in believer's hearts.—We ought to let go the injurious, damned doctrine (wherewith the pope hath defiled all Christendom), that man cannot be certain whether he is in grace before God, or not, and hold for certain that we have a gracious and compassionate God, who has in us a gracious complacency, cares for us as His dear children in earnest and most heartily —for Christ's sake; *item*, that we also have the Holy Ghost, which intercedes for us with crying and groanings unutterable.—In STARKE:—Behold the nature of ejaculatory prayers [*Stossgebetlein*], as they are called, wherein only the heart is lifted to God. In such a way can a believing soul very well pray without ceasing.—[BUNYAN: —O how great a task is it for a poor soul that comes, sensible of sin and the wrath of God, to say in faith but this one word, Father! The Spirit must be sent into the heart for this very thing; it being too great a work for any man to do knowingly and believingly without it.—That one word spoken in faith, is better than a thousand prayers in a formal, lukewarm way.—I myself have often found that when I can say but this word, *Father*, it doth me more good than when I call Him by any other Christian name.—R.]

Ver. 7. LUTHER:—Because Christ has redeemed us, that were under the law, there is no servant any more, nothing but children; therefore can thy power and tyranny, good mistress Law, have no place upon the lordly throne where my Lord Christ is to sit; therefore now I heed thee not, for I am free and a child, that is to be subjected to no servant's place.—The law may well rule and reign over the body and the old man; but the bridal bed, wherein Christ is to have His rest, it should leave unstained; that is, the law should leave the conscience at ease and undisturbed, for this is to reign alone with its bridegroom Christ, in the realm of freedom and of sonship.—"And if a son, then an heir." No one through his works or merit succeeds in becoming heir, but birth alone brings it to him; even so do we also come to the eternal, heavenly possessions, such as forgiveness of sins, righteousness, the glorious resurrection, and eternal life, not through our coöperation, but without any act of ours—we suffer them to be bestowed upon us, and receive them from God through Christ.—Whoever could believe without any doubt, that it were true, and certainly comprehend, how immeasurably great a thing it is, that one should be God's child and heir, such an one would without doubt take little account of the world, with all that therein is esteemed precious and honorable, such as human righteousness, wisdom, dominion, power, money, possessions, honor, pleasure, and the like; yea, all that in the world is honorable and glorious, would be to him loathsome and an abomination.—How great and glorious a bestowment the eternal kingdom and the heavenly inheritance is man's heart in this life can not understand, and still less express. We see in this life only the central point, but in the life to come, we shall see the whole infinite circle.

Vers. 1–7. There are two degrees of the adoption of God's children: the degree of minority, where one is rather servant than child, and the degree of majority, where one has the place of a child.—The bondage of the law the way to the full adoption of God's children.—The relation of the law and of the gospel to adoption with God.—The son, still a minor, must wait till God declares him of age; while the son of full age is not to abdicate the child's place, else he makes a retrogression displeasing to God. Without Christ, under age, through Christ, of full age.—When Christ came, came the time of majority for the people of God; when He comes *to thee*, it comes also for thee, not earlier—but then, really.—GLÖCKLER: The wisdom and love of God in the sending of His Son: Wisdom: He came, when the time was fulfilled: Love: He came to bring redemption, and the adoption of children.—The true intent, virtue, and fruit of the incarnation of the Son of God —When the time is fulfilled, God will send also to thee His Son, and His Spirit into thy heart; only wait and doubt not!—Every time, even the longest, has its fulfillment, for it is subject to God, in the service of His purpose.—KAPFF: The blessedness of the adoption of God's children: It is (1) a condition of freedom, (2) of joyfulness in faith, (3) of heirship to God.—W. HOFACKER:—On the family or house of God, into which, to us as children, access stands open in Christ Jesus: 1) The house or the family of God: there is there a Father, God, a mother—free, unmerited grace, a first-born Brother; many brothers and sisters besides, and a ministering retinue in the holy angels. 2) The different relations in which we may stand to the household of God: *a.* there are some, and they are greatest in number, who stand in a far distant and alien relation to the family of God; *b.* a smaller, less considerable number stand to the family of God in a nearer, but yet not the nearest relation; *c.* the third class stands to it in the full, conscious relation of children, as Paul says, ver. 6. 3) The laborious [*aufgabenreiche*] and yet glorious condition of those, who walk as

children of the house of God: *a.* the first task is, to learn more and more the true temper of children; *b.* the second, to show faithfulness and diligence in the daily work entrusted to them by the Lord; *c.* the third is, to wait in patience and hope for the promised inheritance.—MÜHLHÄUSER: The Abba cry: 1) a sign of being God's child; 2) but only possible through the Spirit of God.—Christ the Redeemer from the bondage of the law, 2) the redemption itself, 3) the consequence of this redemption.—HESSE: In what does sonship with God consist? 1) In the maturity of the spirit; 2) in the joyfulness of prayer; 3) in the certainty of salvation.—AHLFELD: Redemption through Jesus Christ. 1) From what has He redeemed us? From the law, from the constraint and from the curse of the law. 2) What does God offer us through our redemption? Sonship: the spirit of a child and the inheritance of a child.

C. Rebuke, passing over into Sorrowful Complaint.

CHAPTER IV. 8–18.

1. Interrupting the doctrinal exposition, Paul rebukes the incomprehensible backsliding into which they are falling.

(VERS. 8–11.)

8 Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service [were in bondage][1] unto
9 them which by nature are no [not] gods.[2] But now, after that ye have known God,
or rather are known [have been known][3] of God, how turn ye again [how is it that
ye are turning again][4] to the weak and beggarly elements [rudiments], whereunto
10 ye desire again [again anew] to be in bondage? Ye observe [carefully] days, and
11 months, and times [seasons],[5] and years. I am afraid of [respecting] you, lest I
have bestowed upon you labor in vain.

2. In language agitated by sorrow, he complains of the equally ungrounded estrangement, they had suffered to grow up between him and them through the selfish intrigues of the false teachers.

(VERS. 12–18.)

12 Brethren, I beseech you, be [become][5] as I *am;* for I *am* [also *have become*] as
13 ye *are:* [.] ye have not injured me at all [ye injured me in nothing]: [yea] Ye
know how through [that on account of][6] infirmity of the flesh I preached the gos-
14 pel unto you at the first [the first time]. And my [your][7] temptation which was
in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; [,] but received me as an angel of God,
15 *even* as Christ Jesus. Where is then [or What then was][8] the blessedness ye spake
of? for I bear you record, that, if *it had been* possible, ye would have plucked out
16 your own [omit own][9] eyes, and have given them to me. Am I therefore [So then,
am I] become your enemy, because I tell you the truth [or by speaking to you the
17 truth]? They zealously affect you, *but* not well [They pay you court in no good
way];[10] yea, they would exclude [desire to exclude] you,[11] that ye might affect
18 them [may pay them court]. But *it is* good to be zealously affected always in *a*
good *thing* [to be courted in a good way at all times], and not only when I am
present with you.

[1] Ver. 8.—[The idea of *servitude* rather than *service* is more accordant with the connection of thought.—R.]

[2] Ver. 8.—Lachmann, Tischendorf read τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσι θεοῖς, instead of τοῖς μὴ φύσει οὖσι θεοῖς. Rec. [The former reading is that of ℵ. A, B, C, and modern editors generally.—R.]

[3] Ver. 9.—[The tense here is the same as in the preceding clause, and the translation must conform.—R.]

[4] Ver. 9.—[The construction is like ii. 14.—The rendering above given retains the force of the present: ye are in process of turning.—R.]

[5] Ver. 12.—[Γίνεσθε—"become." In the next clause the same verb is to be supplied. The better division of verses would join the last clause with ver. 13, as the better pointing transposes the period and colon.—R.]

[6] Ver. 13.—[This rendering of δι' ἀσθένειαν may now be considered as established.—R.]

[7] Ver. 14.—The reading τὸν πειρ. ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου is followed. So ℵ [[1]A. B. D. [1]F., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Bagge, Ellicott, Alford, Wordsworth, Lightfoot.—R.] Rec. reads τὸν πειρ. μου τὸν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου; its sense is: You have not despised my bodily temptation=me on account of my sickness, by which I was tempted of God. But MSS. authority is strongest for ὑμῶν. Evidently this was not understood, and the Recepta is a conjectural emendation, based on a false interpretation. Πειρασμόν was understood as *calamitas*, as an infirmity in the body of Paul himself, because in ver. 13 this is spoken of; and so ὑμῶν had either to be entirely erased, or replaced by μου; and τόν added to connect ἐν σαρκί μου with πειρασμόν. On the sense of the approved reading, see Exeg. Notes. [Schmoller follows Lachmann's punctuation, which puts a full stop after σαρκί μου, but this is objectionable, and not adopted by later editors. It is better to put a comma only after "rejected."—R.]

[8] Ver. 15.—There are three readings: 1) The Recepta, τίς οὖν ἦν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν. 2) The same, only without ἦν. 3) Ποῦ οὖν ὁ μακαρ. ὑμῶν, without ἦν, which gives no sense with ποῦ. The last reading is well supported, and found in ℵ., but seems to be a very old gloss; for a change of ποῦ into the more difficult τίς cannot readily be explained. Of the two others, 2) seems preferable, though we cannot definitely decide. [Ποῦ is adopted by Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, Lightfoot; τίς, without ἦν by Ellicott. If we adopt 1) or 2), the E. V. must be altered: "What then was"—*i. e.* of what kind was, etc.—R.]

[9] Ver. 15.—["Own" is not warranted by the simple τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν.—R.]

[10] Ver. 17.—[On the alterations, vers. 17, 18, see Exeg. Notes. Ellicott's translation has been adopted only in part.—R.]

[11] Ver. 17.—Ἡμᾶς [instead of ὑμᾶς.—R.] is an unnecessary conjecture [of Beza's].

[12] Ver. 18—The reading ζηλοῦσθε is an unnecessary conjecture in all probability, though found in ℵ. B. [Rejected by all editors of importance. Meyer, Ellicott, Wordsworth, read τὸ ζηλοῦσθαι; Lachmann, Alford, Lightfoot omit the article. It probably disappeared with the incorrect reading of the verb in some MSS.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 8. **Howbeit then, when ye knew not God.**—This sounds as if it continued the doctrinal development, but it takes a practical turn in the very next verse. "Now no longer a servant," Paul had said,—but, he now continues, reverting to the former time, then were ye servants—when ye did not know God. Yet this is doubtless not merely a note of time, but a statement of the ground of the then existing bondage = as certainly as ye are now no longer servants, just so certainly was there a valid ground for your being formerly servants, when ye knew not God, namely, servants of idols. But comprehensible on this account as your earlier bondage was, equally incomprehensible is your present surrendering of yourselves into bondage again. For the "not knowing God" has ceased, hence with the cause, the effect also; they are, as already said, no longer δοῦλοι, and therefore a δουλεύειν in their case has no longer any justification whatever; their new bondage to the law is now as much without warrant as was their former bondage to idols.—**Ye were in bondage to them which by nature are not gods.**—This indicates more precisely the kind of bondage, in which the readers, as being Gentiles, formerly found themselves. From the fact that he so distinctly states of what kind their bondage was, it appears to be beyond doubt that he could not place them, as respected their pre-Christian state, in one category with the Jewish Christians as respected the pre-Christian state of these (ver. 3), nor comprehend them together under "those in bondage under the rudiments of the world." Their bondage was, it is true, also bondage, but nevertheless an essentially different, more wretched one: they were not "kept in bondage" *sc.* by God Himself for a while, from pedagogic reasons, under a law, but it was a bondage resulting from their not knowing God, and being servants, moreover, τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσι θεοῖς=to those gods, which yet are in their real nature not gods, but are only so called; they are in fact according to Paul's teaching elsewhere, *demons*. [Undoubtedly there is a "bondage" here referred to somewhat different from that of ver. 3, but the distinction seems to be, that in addition to the pedagogic bondage, in which all were held, these Galatians, or heathen, were in even a worse condition. The sense of the two readings must be noticed; that of Rec., τοῖς μὴ φύσει οὖσι θεοῖς joins the negative μή with φύσει; not gods in reality, only thought to be so; but the better sustained order, τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσι θεοῖς joins the negative with οὖσι, asserting that they were not gods at all, did not exist; whether 1 Cor. x. 20 justifies us in supposing that the implied antithesis is *demons*, is very doubtful. Meyer and Ellicott remark that this is a subjective negation.—R.]

Ver. 9. **Rather have been known of God.**—A corrective climax, in order to give the following "how" still more emphasis. "This knowing on the part of God is of course not used of a theoretical knowing—for in that sense every one is an object of Divine knowledge—but of an affectionate, loving, interested knowledge; comp. 1 Cor. viii. 3; xiii. 12, and in the Hebrew ידע as frequently used. The aorist points to an act of God in the past, which was the act of adoption." Wieseler.—**How is it that ye are turning again?**—Πάλιν does not belong to "the rudiments" but to "turn" therefore not as if they had already before served the στοιχεῖα, but πάλιν only affirms that a second, new turning [*Umwandlung*] was taking place with them first from idols to God, now from God to "the rudiments of the world"=how turn you again—namely, to the στοιχεῖα?—In ἐπιστρέφετε, moreover, there is not of necessity implied the idea of turning back, but simply that of turning away; although in the expression: "Conversion from idols to God" the thought of an original apostasy from God lies at the foundation, yet it lay being rather in the background; and as ἐπιστρέφετε has in itself an entirely general signification, it could very well be applied, even in a case where there was no reference to a turning back; indeed there was scarcely another word to express this turning away, this striking into a particular course. [Schmoller, having adopted Wieseler's view of ver. 3, is of course, consistent in following out that interpretation here, but it is very evident that this interpretation is difficult to defend. Here, and especially in the final clause of the verse, there must be a departure from the more obvious meaning of the words, to admit the idea that they had not *relapsed* as well as *lapsed* by their apostasy. Πάλιν does not necessarily imply a turning back to the same things but to similar things, not *retro* but

iterum, i. e., not again to heathenism indeed, but to Judaism, both of which are included in "the rudiments of the world." So MEYER, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, LIGHTFOOT and others. The present tense (ἐπιστρέφετε) is used, for the change was still going on. Comp. i. 6 (LIGHTFOOT).—R.]—The **rudiments** are called **weak**, because they have not the power to atone for sinful man, and by communication of the Spirit to transform him inwardly, agreeably to what Paul says of the law, *e. g.* Gal. iii. 21; Rom. viii. 3; comp. also Heb. vii. 18. They are called **beggarly** on account of their relatively imperfect matter in comparison with the perfection and the riches of the gospel. WIESELER.—**Whereunto ye desire again anew to be in bondage.**—"Again" belongs to "serve," not as if they had already once served "the rudiments" but they have already served, they have been δοῦλοι; and now they wish to be so again, although servants of another lord, and thus they wish to begin the δουλεύειν again ἄνωθεν, from the beginning, after it has scarcely as yet come to an end. [ELLICOTT's statement is preferable: "They had been slaves to the rudiments in the form of heathenism; now they were desiring to enslave themselves *again* to the rudiments, and to *commence* them *anew* in the form of Judaism."—R.]

Ver. 10. **Ye carefully observe.**—Proof of the declaration first made: "Ye desire to be in bondage." [The punctuation is a matter of dispute. An interrogation mark is placed at the close of the verse by TISCHENDORF, LIGHTFOOT, and others, but ELLICOTT, WIESELER, and more lately MEYER and ALFORD (both of whom formerly made the verse interrogative) adopt a simple period. This suits the transition to ver. 11 much better.—R.] "Παρατηρεῖσθε: to observe carefully, not to celebrate, or else the objects would have been σάββατα, νεομηνίας, ἑορτάς. The Apostle means to say, that they were not only given to the celebration, but, precisely like the Jews, were already scrupulous also as to the correct reckoning of time for their holy days. Days, with reference to the Sabbath; months, probably with reference to the new moons, not, because certain months, the seventh especially, were regarded as peculiarly holy months; seasons, within the year, with reference to the feasts; years with reference to the Sabbatical year, not the year of jubilee, which was no longer celebrated." WIESELER.—This passage shows how far and how far not, the Galatians had as yet been led astray. [Comp. Col. ii. 16. ALFORD is scarcely warranted in saying that this verse is at variance with any and every theory of the Christian Sabbath, since the reference is evidently to Jewish observances, Jewish days, etc. WIESELER supposes that they were then celebrating a Sabbatical year, because the present tense is used, but this is pressing it too far.—R.]

Ver. 11. **I am afraid respecting you.**—Not superfluously has Paul added the ὑμᾶς, but in the consciousness that it is not his own interest (as for instance his having labored fruitlessly, in itself regarded), but the readers' that his anxiety respects. MEYER.—Luther aptly says: *Lacrimas Pauli hæc verba spirant* [These words breathe the tears of Paul].

Ver. 12. **Become as I.**—The Apostle's reprehension of their conduct naturally prepares the way for the admonition to a change of this. Yet he does little more than briefly indicate the exhortation, without continuing it, but goes on rather to make mention, with painful emotion, of his personal relation to the readers, as it had been and as it had now become.—The sense of the briefly expressed admonition is not quite evident: but probably=become like me in freedom from Judaistic observance; the motive to this is then added: **For I also have become as ye are**, like you Gentiles, through my ἐθνικῶς ζῆν, comp. ii. 14, and moreover the Apostle means, doubtless: when I brought you the gospel.—[Schmoller joins **Brethren, I beseech you,** with what follows, but the punctuation of the E. V. is better. The meaning of the first clause seems plain. In regard to the second, "two interpretations deserve to be considered: 1. 'For I was once in bondage as ye now are.' I once *was* a Jew, as ye now Judaize. 2. 'For I abandoned my legal ground of righteousness, I became a Gentile like you.' The latter sense is simpler grammatically, as it understands the same verb which occurs in the former clause, 'because,' not 'was.' It is also more in character with the intense personal feeling which pervades the passage. 'I gave up all those time-honored customs, all those dear associations of race, to become like you. I have lived as a Gentile that I might preach to you Gentiles. Will you then abandon me, when I have abandoned all for you?' This sense is well adapted both to the tender appeal 'Brethren, I beseech you,' and to the eager explanation which follows: 'Ye did me no wrong'" (LIGHTFOOT).—**Ye injured me in nothing.**—The emphasis does not rest on *me*, a mere enclitic in the Greek, as if implying that they had injured God and Christ. As the verb is aorist like those which follow, it seems best to refer this to that time of his first preaching. In that case the meaning "I have no personal grounds of complaint" (adopted by many from CHRYSOSTOM to LIGHTFOOT) is untenable. He begins with this clause to adduce their former treatment of him, as a reason for "becoming as he is." The next clause is not strictly adversative.—R.]

Ver. 13. **Yea ye know that on account of infirmity of the flesh.**—"The only correct, because the only grammatical explanation, is: On account of weakness of the flesh, so it appears from this, that Paul was necessitated, on his first journey through Galatia, to linger there, although properly it had not lain in his plan, and that he had during this compulsory sojourn preached the gospel to the Galatians. How and from what cause he was suffering, whether from natural sickness, or from injuries undergone for the gospel's sake, we do not know. Paul does not, by the mention of a previously unintended activity among the Galatians, work against his purpose, but rather right in the line of his purpose, since the love which received him so heartily and joyfully, must have been so much the greater, the less it was founded on the duty of a thankfulness owing for a benefit previously intended for the receivers, and for efforts made strictly on their account" (MEYER);—or rather, perhaps; "the less he, considering the impediment of his bodily condi-

tion. could expect such a reception" (WIESELER). That is, we suppose, because, through his infirmity he was in many ways impeded in his public labors, because his preaching of the gospel was a variously marred, imperfect one. He means to say then, that he preached *in a state of* bodily weakness. But the words themselves are not to be so translated. [WORDSWORTH: "On account of the *infirmity in his flesh* and the consequent temptation to his *hearers*, he was naturally led—perhaps he was guided by the Holy Spirit—to shun in the *first instance* the more civilized population, of Asia and Europe, as to go rather to the despised Galilees of the world, and then when his reputation was established, to proceed through Macedonia to Athens, and thence to Corinth and to Ephesus, and so finally to Rome." But this learned author can scarcely be warranted in making this the implication in πρότερον, as he does, in order *to deny* a second visit to Galatia.—R.] Πρότερον, apparently not=formerly, referring generally to time past viewed from the present; for the addition would then be entirely superfluous; but special=the first of two definite occasions. The second time of "preaching" is, however, not the present writing of the Epistle, for εὐαγγελίζω is invariably used of oral preaching; but there is a twofold presence of the Apostle among the Galatians presupposed, to the first of which the πρότερον refers. In fact, the book of Acts also mentions two visits of Paul in Galatia, Acts xvi. 6; xviii. 23. "Paul therefore adds τὸ πρότερον, in order to designate with full distinctness the first visit, during which he founded the churches. At his second visit, also, the joyful experiences which he had had τὸ πρότερον were not repeated; the churches were already infected with Judaism" (MEYER).

Ver. 14. With the reading πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν it appears best to set a period after ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, and to connect the words with οἴδατε ver. 13=you know how you, through my bodily infirmity, and the hampering of my evangelical activity in consequence of it, were put on proof=experienced the temptation to think unfavorably of me. Unquestionably the connection is somewhat difficult. But plainly the connection with what follows is wholly inadmissible, although MEYER accepts it=you have not despised your trial in my flesh. But what is meant by despising the trial, &c.? Who could understand it at all? MEYER himself has to alter the expression somewhat, so as to mean: contemptuously repel. And besides what would be signified by the climatic expression with two words: ἐξουθενήσατε and ἐξεπτύσατε? This, however, manifestly constitutes the antithesis to the strong affirmative expression ἀλλ' ὡς ἄγγελον κ. τ. λ. The one as well as the other therefore refers to himself. He praises this in them, that they did not reject and even spit out *him*, as there was room to apprehend, but—the exact opposite—received him as an angel, nay, as Christ. [The reading ὑμῶν must be adopted, but this by no means compels us to follow the punctuation and connection just indicated. MEYER, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, WORDSWORTH, LIGHTFOOT and most editors reject Lachmann's punctuation, which makes the latter part of the verse intolerably harsh and abrupt, and does little to remove the difficulty of the former part. As WORDSWORTH intimates "the teacher's infirmity is the people's trial." Paul's infirmity, whatever it was, put them on trial, was the thing which tried them (πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν), and yet they did not despise and loathe him on account of this infirmity, but received him, etc.—R.]

Ver. 15. **What was then [or where then is] the blessedness ye spake of?** [The E. V. gives a sufficiently correct paraphrase, if ποῦ be read.—R.] WEISELER:=How highly blessed you pronounced yourselves, *sc.* that you were able to hear me?--Τίς=how great. Οὖν comes in somewhat abruptly, but is explained by the emotional character of the style. Paul transfers himself vividly into the time when they received him with such veneration, and exclaims: How was it then, what a boasting of blessedness then arose?—With that agrees, as a proof, what follows: **For I bear you record.**—MEYER: Of what character then was you boasting of blessedness?=how inconstant? More farfetched is the explanation: On what was your boasting of blessedness founded? Others supply ἐστί: What then is your boasting of blessedness?=it is nothing any longer; it is at an end, therefore somewhat in the sense of ποῦ. But the following γάρ does not agree with this.

That, if it had been possible, *etc.*—A proverbial mode of speech, derived from the high value and indispensableness of the eyes. Puerile is the explanation: Paul had an opthalmia, and says here, that the Galatians, if it had been possible would have given him their sound eyes. [The E. V. "your own eyes," giving an emphasis, unwarranted by the Greek, favors this theory of "opthalmia." It is well defended by Dr. BROWN, *Horæ Subscecivæ*, yet scarcely sustained by this passage.—R.]

Ver. 16. **So then, am I become your enemy.**—A sharp antithesis. The simplest sense: Since you were so minded towards me, can I be afterwards regarded as your enemy only **because I tell you the truth** (instead of speaking according to your fancy). The sentence is introduced somewhat abruptly, or the inference implied in ὥστε is not so very obvious. It may be explained, however, from the emotional character of the language. The emphasis lies on "tell the truth;" but in the first instance "enemy" (ἐχθρός), as constituting a contrast, must be made prominent; it therefore stands first, and by placing ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν *at the end*, this also is emphasized. The Apostle had already told the Galatians the truth, rebuking their errors and short-comings, before the writing of his Epistle (for this they had not seen as yet), at a second visit in person among them. [The present form of the E. V. seems against this, but the participle means "by telling the truth," which of course admits of a part reference. WORDSWORTH renders "being true," to avoid the admission of a second visit.—R.]

Ver. 17. **They pay you court in no honest way.**—[So ELLICOTT. LIGHTFOOT: "As ζηλοῦν would seem to have one and the same sense throughout this passage, its more ordinary meanings with the accusative, as 'to admire, emulate,' must be discarded. It signifies rather 'to busy one's self about, take interest in,' a sense

which lies close to the original meaning of ζῆλος, if correctly derived from ζέω." So Schmoller *liebeifern.*—R.] "They also, it is true [*sc.* the false teachers; for we usually abstain from naming those whose very names produce in us dislike and aversion (CALVIN)] will fain have an affectionate zeal towards you, and contend for the possession of you: but in view of the truth, that, while they will bring you out of affectionate zeal, is worse than what you already have, we must say; they are zealous for you to no good." EWALD.—**They desire to exclude you,**—first from me, and thus from the pure gospel to them and their teaching.—Ἵνα, (that) with the indicative present is certainly harsh; but MEYER'S interpretation is altogether too forced. He feels himself obliged on account of this harshness to take *ἵνα=ubi, in quo statu;* whereby, by which exclusion, when it has taken place, you, with your zeal are directed to them as objects of your interest. [The final sense of *ἵνα, i. e.*, they do it for this purpose, is preferable; the indicative being regarded by ALFORD and ELLICOTT as a solecism, though Lightfoot remarks that this usage, while quite unclassical, is often found in later writers. MEYER insists very strongly however upon the local sense.—R.]

Ver. 18. **But it is good to be courted in a good way at all times.**—The "courting" of which they are the objects, he has been obliged to censure, and accordingly he adds (turning to the readers themselves): It is indeed good (*καλόν*) to be an object of the affectionate zeal of others, good to be zealously loved—but only in a good thing. It is only good to be zealously loved in a good laudable cause, and for the sake of it, but not as now, on account of an evil cause, namely, apostacy from the truth. This thought Paul completes by the addition: At all times it is good to be loved for the sake of a good cause. But (he says) more accurately considered, it is only good, when one is zealously loved *at all times*, for the sake of a good cause, and not merely for a while, or at certain times, *i. e.*, when one is always *worthy* of zealous love (for the sake of a good cause). This thought however, Paul does not leave thus general, but suddenly—disturbing the concinuity of the discourse, though quite in congruity with the emotion expressed in the language of this section—gives it a definite application—**not only when I am present with you.**—Then you showed yourselves worthy of love, but, alas, not now, when I am not with you.—MEYER and WIESELER understand the beginning of the sentence thus: good it is, that zeal is shown, etc.; and not so that the Galatians are understood as the objects of the zeal, but so that the zeal ἐν καλῷ is opposed to the zeal of the false teachers, which was ἐν κακῷ. But justice is not thus done to the passive infinitive. [This verse has caused much discussion. The following results seem clear: 1. That the verb ζηλοῦν is to retain the same meaning throughout. 2. That the last infinitive is passive, and the Galatians the object. But 3. the force of ἐν καλῷ is doubtful. It may be (*a*) merely adverbial (ELLICOTT). "It is a good thing to be the object of courting *in an honest way* (as you are by me, though not by them) at all times, and not merely when I happen to be with you." (*b*) It may indicate the sphere, in contrast with that of the false teachers (ALFORD). It is a good thing (for you) to be the objects of this zeal, *in a good cause*, at all times and by every body, not only when I am present with you. I do not grudge the court that is paid you. Only let them do it in an honorable cause. (*c*) Or the phrase may be pressed, as is done by Schmoller, to imply a contrast between their present and their former state. LIGHTFOOT prefers a view similar to this, but, as he admits, *it supplies too much.* As (*b*) is entirely consistent with the requirements of 1, and 2, it seems preferable.—R.]

[Many commentators (including BENGEL, WORDSWORTH, LIGHTFOOT) put a comma at the close of Ver. 18, thus joining the next verse most closely with this section. There is a sufficient change of tone and thought to justify a full stop, but it seems doubtful whether a new section or paragraph should begin with ver. 19. Most commentators, even those who separate vers. 18 and 19, begin the new paragraph with ver. 21; with more propriety apparently. Schmoller, however, joins ver. 19 with ver. 21, and divides the sections accordingly. While the matter is not of sufficient moment to warrant an alteration of his arrangement, the usual division presents the Apostle's thought more satisfactorily. See EXEG. NOTES on vers. 19, 20 in the next section.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The characteristic of heathenism is, lack of the knowledge of God.* A heathen was before his conversion an atheist (Eph. ii. 12). True they had a certain religiosity, but "Knowledge of God" is for Paul at least, a very definite positive idea, essentially distinct from that religiosity. What the heathen worship are by nature not gods.—A hint not to overvalue in an unscriptural manner the religious feeling of the heathen world, which manifested itself in idolatrous worship; also not to see in it too readily anything positive, a prophecy of the true knowledge of God, something only different from it in degree. Rather, it is something negative, a having lost the truth, or at most an echo of that truth which in its main substance is lost. For, according to Rom. i., the heathen also had indeed originally a knowledge of God, but this before they became heathen by their being servants to them which are by nature not gods; with the coming in of this servitude they lost the knowledge of God. Very different then was the standing of the Israelite from that of the heathen, *i. e.*, although he was "in bondage under the rudiments of the world," yes, "shut up under sin," he was yet one "knowing God," not "without God" (ἄθεος) in the world.

2. *Confidence between teachers and hearers.*—"There must be more depending on hearty confidence between teachers and hearers, than is commonly thought, because the Apostle so solicitously strives for it, and assures them he has not lost his affection for them, but is still mindful of their first love." RIEGER.—The preacher, it is true, is in the first place only the bearer and bringer of the divine word, and it is primarily this itself, which opens and wins

hearts. The man, compared with the word which he brings, falls entirely into the background, as appears from the very declarations of Paul in this section. Had not the word which he brought, in itself won hearts, had not these conceived confidence in the word as such, for the sake of its contents, Paul himself would have found no access among them; for in his personal appearance, in view of the weakness of the flesh, with which he came, there was at least nothing captivating to the hearts of men. —But on the other hand, simultaneously with the receiving of the word, there is also formed a personal relation to the bringer of it; he is not a mere instrument, but a personality, and in his bringing of the word comes into consideration as such. A bond of confidence and love is knit between the hearer and the teacher; to him who brings what searches the heart in its inmost recesses, who proclaims to us the word of salvation and eternal life, our heart must also necessarily turn in love, if it has suffered the word to gain any hold of it whatever. And on the other hand the personal bond which is formed, will then in its turn have an essential influence in promoting the reception of the word and steadfastness in faith. The preacher may also, as Paul shows, expressly appeal to this personal relation, may and should value highly the love which he experiences, may—not indeed affect an injured tone when it is withdrawn from him, but may well, when the Church has in any way gone astray, use the personal relation that has been formed, as a motive in his admonitions.

[3. *Observance of days, etc.* The scrupulous observance of "days and months and seasons and years," is to the Apostle a token that his labor in the gospel has not resulted in appropriate effects. These things belong to "the weak and beggarly elements," to which the Galatians were returning. That there is no allusion to the observance of the Lord's Day is evident, for this cannot be classed among these "rudiments," to which they desire to be again anew in bondage. It could not be classed among "heathen rudiments," for they knew nothing of it; nor with "the bondage of the law," for God's Sabbatic law ante-dated the Mosaic law (comp. the fourth commandment, "Remember"). And whatever of legal bondage had been linked with the observance of the Jewish Sabbath was eliminated together with the change to the first day of the week. This at once removes the Lord's Day from the category of "days" (ver. 10), and also of "weak and beggarly elements" (ver. 9). The mode of observance is learned from the Lord's words: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," which at the same time imply, when rightly understood, the perpetual necessity for a Sabbath.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 8. Cramer:—"To reflect often on our former miserable condition of heathenism, serves to move us to thanksgiving for the benefit received." Luther:—There is a twofold knowledge of God, a common and a special. The common all men have by nature, in that they know that there is a God, who has made heaven and earth, &c. But how our Lord God is minded towards us, what He will give us and do for us, that we may be redeemed from sin and be saved, of that men know nothing. They know not what pleases or displeases God, and so adore, instead of the actual God, something that their own heart has dreamed out and feigningly devised, but which, in very truth, is naught.—[Brown:—In false religion in all its forms, nothing is more remarkable than its enslaving, degrading influence on the minds of its votaries.—R.]

Ver. 9. Luther:—We are known of God, rather than we know Him. For what we do towards such knowledge is nothing else than to hold still, and let God occupy Himself with us, namely, by giving us His word, which we lay hold of through the faith which He also works in us, and thus to become God's children.—We shall not fare better than the dear Apostles themselves fared, who in their lifetime had to see the congregations that had been built up through their office with much pains and labor, so sadly torn down, that for very pity their heart was ready to break.—It may easily and quickly happen, that one apostatize from the truth. For even Christians, who are in earnest as to sound doctrine, consider not sufficiently, how precious and most needful a treasure is the right and true knowledge of Christ. Besides there are exceeding few among those that hear the preaching of faith, that are tried by the holy cross and spiritual conflict, and that sometimes have with sin, death and devil a skirmish, but the greater part live on in all security, without all combat and strife. So long as they have sound teachers with them, they speak according to them; but when these their true teachers are away, and the wolves in sheeps' clothing come creeping in, at once that takes place with them, which happened to the Galatians, namely, that they are soon and easily seduced and perverted.—When the foundation is destroyed, it is then all one, whether men turn themselves to the law, or to idols. Whoever falls from grace upon the law, has as hard a fall as he that falls from grace into heathenism, for out of Christ there is nothing else than idolatry and a vain image of God.—"To the weak and beggarly rudiments." When the law accomplishes its right and fitting work or office, it accuses and condemns men; then it is not a weak and beggarly element, but strong and rich, yea, it is an immeasurable, invincible power and wealth, against which the conscience is indeed weak and poor.—It is most admirable that St. Paul speaks so contemptuously of the law. For he does it to this end, that they who will through the law be made righteous, may from day to day become still weaker and more beggarly. For they are of themselves weak and beggarly, *i. e.*, by nature children of wrath and guilty of perdition, and lay hold then on that which also is nothing else than merely infirmity and beggary, whereby they will fain become strong and rich.

Ver. 10. "Ye carefully observe days." Here might some one say: If the good Galatians did so great a sin, in that they observed days, months, seasons, &c., how comes it then, that ye do not also sin, who yet do the like? Answer: in that we keep Sunday, Christmas, Easter, and the like

days of solemnity or festivals, we do it with all freedom, we burden with such ceremonies no one's conscience, nor teach, that men must needs keep them, in order to be thereby justified and saved, or to make satisfaction for sin. But on this account we keep them, that matters may go on in the church in good discipline and order, and that outward unity may not be sundered (for inwardly we have another unity). But the principal cause is this, that the ministry may remain in its full exercise, and that the people may have their certain appointed time, when they may come together, hear God's word, and therefrom know God. *Item*, that they may take the sacrament, pray in common for all necessities of all Christendom, and may thank our dear Lord God for all His benefits. BERLENB. BIBLE:—In such things that is even against Christianity which is urged upon men over and above Christianity. He that can comprehend what mischief the evangelical spirit suffers from such patchwork, has made great progress.

Ver. 11. HEUBNER:—The teacher labors upon an uncertainty, knows not what he accomplishes, he sows upon hope.

Vers. 12–20. RIEGER:—As much depends on such earnest remonstrances for opening the hearers' hearts, as on the most convincing arguments.

Ver. 12. SPENER:—A true pastor is sensitive in no particular, save in what is contrary to the honor of God, and the salvation of His flock.—LUTHER:—That he gives the Galatians so good words, is as much as to mix and temper the bitter wormwood drink so with honey and sugar that it may become sweet and pleasant. Even so do parents, when they have well flogged their children, give them good words, give them gingerbread, apples, pears, nuts and the like, that the children may take note and understand that their parents have at heart their good.

Vers. 13, 14. It may well be that human reason stumbles and starts back, when it beholds the slight, contemptible and weak nature of the dear Christians, wherein there is so much of suffering, yea, the world has ever counted all God's servants for great fools, who will fain comfort, help and counsel others, *item*, inasmuch as they boast of so great heavenly possessions and treasures, of righteousness, power, strength, victory over sin, death and all evil, of everlasting joy, &c., and are yet the poorest beggars and moreover weak, troubled and despised.—STARKE:—True servants of the gospel are angels of God, as having the name of messengers and heralds of the divine will, even as also the invisible and heavenly spirits bear the name of angels from a like office.—LANGE:—If teachers wish to be looked on as angels of God, and in a certain sense as Christ Himself, they must also approve themselves as good angels, and not as Satan's angels and servants, and discharge their office with such purity, as they have Paul for an example.—[BURKITT:—It is an high commendation to a people, when neither poverty nor deformity, nor any deficiency, which may render a minister of the gospel base and contemptible in the estimation of the world, can possibly diminish any thing of that respect which they know to be due and payable unto him.—R.]

Ver. 15. HEUBNER:—Let the apostate reflect, when he was happiest, how blessed he was before he fell.—BERLENB. BIB.:—As indeed we are owing more than the eyes of the body, to those that have opened to us the eyes of the soul.—HEDINGER:—A beautiful proof of faith, to love those from the heart, that plant faith within us! O the horror, that some would gladly tear out tongue and eyes from those that teach us the word of the kingdom of heaven!—CRAMER:—It is everywhere the same, that new preachers are welcome, and soon get followers and a great concourse. While the sign is new, it is hung against the wall; but when it is old, it is thrown under the bench.—[BROWN:—When the gospel is remarkably successful, the danger is not of converts not being sufficiently attached, but of their being inordinately attached, to the minister who has been the instrument of conveying to them so great a benefit. The being greatly applauded, is scarcely any proof that a minister has been successful; the being highly esteemed and cordially loved, is a considerably strong presumption that he has; the being regarded with indifference and dislike, is a clear proof that he has not.—R.]

Ver. 16. HEUBNER:—Him who tells us the truth, we ought to count for our true and best friend.—LUTHER:—In the world matters go altogether strangely and against reason, namely, he that speaks truth becomes an unwelcome guest, yea, is counted for an enemy; but this is not so among good friends, and still less among Christians.—STARKE:—He that hates any one, because he tells him the truth, such an one betrays himself very clearly as no child of God.

Ver. 17. LUTHER:—This is the way of all false spirits, to put on a friendly behavior, and give people the best words, so as to get a hold. When they first come creeping in, they swear most fervently, that they seek nothing else than alone how they may further God's honor and men's salvation; they promise to those that receive their teaching, that they shall certainly be saved. And with such assumed appearance of godliness and sheep's clothing, the ravening wolves do immensely great harm to the Christian church, where pastors are not active and vigilant and earnest to withstand them.—RIEGER:—Great pains given to any thing, great certainty assumed concerning it, is indeed something very taking to men's minds; but zeal alone gives no certain proof of truth. The doctrine is not to be judged according to the zeal, but the zeal according to the doctrine. The zeal does not make the cause good, but the cause must make the zeal good.—[BUNYAN:—Zeal without knowledge is like a mettled horse without eyes or like a sword in a madman's hands.—RICCALTOUN:—In reading the history of the church it is hard to say whether what has gone, and still goes under the name of *zeal*, has done more good or hurt to religion.—BURKITT:—The old practice has ever been amongst seducers, first to alienate the people's minds from their own teachers, and next get themselves looked upon as alone, and only worthy to have room in the people's hearts.—R.]

Ver. 18. STARKE:—Zeal for good must be enduring.—This is a human feeling, which exists in many, even pious souls. They are zealous in good, when faithful teachers are present, but when they are absent, or it may be dead, they slacken in their zeal.

D. Confirmation of the freedom of Christians, from the narrative of the Scripture concerning the two sons of Abraham, Ishmael and Isaac, by means of an interpretation referring it to the Jewish and the Christian Church.

CHAPTER IV. 19—30.

(Vers. 21–31. *The Epistle for the 4th Sunday in Lent.*)

19 My little children[1] of whom I travail in birth again [with whom I am again in
20 travail] until Christ be formed in you, I desire [I could wish indeed] to be
present with you now, and to change my voice [tone];[2] for I stand in doubt of you
21 [am perplexed about you].[3] Tell me ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not
22 hear[4] the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bond-
maid, the other by a free woman [one by the bondmaid, and one by the free wo-
23 man]. But he *who was* of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of
24 the free woman *was* by promise [through the[5] promise]. Which things are an
allegory [are allegorical]:[6] for these are the [omit the][7] two covenants; the one
from the [omit the] mount Sinai, which gendereth to [bearing children unto]
25 bondage, which is Agar [Hagar].[8] For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia [(For
Sinai is a mountain in Arabia), or For the word Agar means in Arabia mount
Sinai; or For this Hagar represents mount Sinai in Arabia], and answereth to
[she ranks[9] with] Jerusalem which now is [the present Jerusalem], and is [for[10] she
26 is] in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is
27 the mother of us all [and she is our[11] mother]. For it is written, Rejoice, thou
barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the
desolate hath many more children [many are the children of the desolate more]
28 than she which [who] hath a husband. Now we [But ye],[12] brethren, as Isaac was,
29 are the [omit the] children of promise. But [still] as then he that was born after
30 the flesh persecuted him *that was born* after the Spirit, even so *it is* now. Never-
theless what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the
son of the bondwoman shall not be heir [shall in no wise[13] be heir] with the son[14]
of the free woman.

[1] Ver. 19.—ℵ. τέκνα. [So B. F. G., Lachmann; but ℵ.[3] A. C. K. L. read τεκνία, adopted by Tischendorf and most recent Editors. Occurs nowhere else in Paul's writings.—R.]

[2] Ver. 20.—[Φωνήν, literally "voice," but "tone" is a more intelligible rendering.—R.]

[3] Ver. 20.—["Am perplexed"; so Ellicott, Alford, Lightfoot. Schmoller (with doubtful propriety) throws this verse into a parenthesis.—R.]

[4] Ver. 21.—Ἀναγινώσκετε, an ancient gloss. [followed by the Vulgate, but rejected by all modern Editors.—R.]

[5] Ver. 23.—ℵ. omits τῆς. [Undoubtedly to be retained, and preserved in the English translation.—R.]

[6] Ver. 24.—[Ἀλληγορούμενα, "allegorical" (Alford, Ellicott). Older English versions vary greatly. Against the meaning "allegorized," see EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[7] Ver. 24.—Elz. reads αἱ δύο, against decisive authorities. ℵ.[1] inserts, ℵ.[3] omits αἱ.

[8] Ver. 25.—The Rec. reads: τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ. Besides this we find these readings: 1. τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος—2. τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ ὄρος—3. τὸ Ἄγαρ Σινᾶ ὄρος—4. τὸ δὲ Ἄγαρ Σινᾶ ὄρος κ. τ. λ. It is difficult to decide which is the correct reading, since the weight of authority is about equal for some of these readings. The Rec. is supported mostly by cursives. 1. is decidedly better sustained; ℵ. has it, but with an addition found in no other MSS. (ὂν before ἐν τῇ Ἀρ). 2. and 3. are very weakly supported; but 4. is well sustained. The choice then seems to be between 1. and 4.: τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ and τὸ δὲ Ἄγαρ Σινᾶ; and between these it is scarcely possible to make a positive decision. [It may be remarked that the readings Rec. and 4, differ only in the substitution of δέ for γάρ; since this can readily be accounted for (γάρ first omitted because of the closely following Ἄγαρ, then δέ inserted for connection, or to correspond with μέν, ver. 24), it is perhaps better to regard the choice as lying between Rec. and 1. The former is adopted by Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott, Alford, Wordsworth; 1. by Lachmann and Lightfoot among others. In favor of each, see the above-named commentators. Lightfoot has two valuable notes, p. 189 *sq.* 1. is certainly *lectio brevior*; Rec. *lectio difficilior*; Ἄγαρ may have been carelessly inserted from ver 24, but it was even more likely to have been carelessly omitted after γάρ.—The exegetical difficulty is as great as the critical. Of the three English renderings given above, I. follows reading I., II. and III., the Rec. See EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[9] Ver. 25.—The readings συστοιχοῦσα and ἡ συστοιχοῦσα are not weakly supported, but still must be regarded as exegetical glosses; not without value in the exposition of the passage.—[If a comma be put after "Arabia," it is unnecessary to supply "she."—R.]

10 Ver 25.—[Rec. δέ; followed by Vulgate, E. V., but weakly supported. ℵ. A. B. C. F. read γάρ; so modern Editors.—R.]

11 Ver. 26.—The better attested reading, μήτηρ ἡμῶν, is to be preferred, on internal grounds also to μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν. "Πάντων has come into the text, partly because of such parallel passages as Rom. iv. 16; Gal. iii. 26, 28; partly because of the multitude of τέκνα in the quotation ver. 27 (Wieseler). [Πάντων, Rec. ℵ.[3] A. C.[3] K. L., many fathers, Wordsworth. Bracketted by Lachmann. Omitted in ℵ.[1] B. D. F. many versions and cursives; rejected by Tischendorf. Meyer, Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot.—The E. V. "which is" is perhaps more literal, but Ellicott's rendering, given above, is more forcible, and allowable with ἥτις.—R.]

12 Ver. 28.—"The reading ὑμεῖς–ἐστε is, with Lachmann, Tischendorf and others, to be preferred to the common text ἡμεῖς–ἐσμεν, since the latter appears to be a correction from ἡμῶν (ver. 26) and ὑμεῖς is more lively on account of its application to the readers" (Wieseler). ℵ. however has ἡμεῖς. [Both are well supported, but ὑμεῖς is adopted by most Editors on internal grounds.—R.]

13 Ver. 30.—[Lightfoot follows ℵ. B. D. in reading κληρονομήσει (apparently a correction from LXX).—The double negative οὐ–μή is rendered by Ellicott, "in no wise."—R.]

14 Ver. 30.—Τοῦ υἱοῦ is omitted in ℵ., but inserted by the corrector. [Instead of τῆς ἐλευθέρας we find also μου Ἰσαάκ (from the LXX).—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 19. **My little children.**—[Lightfoot: "A mode of address common in St. John, but not found elsewhere in St. Paul. Here the diminutive expresses both the tenderness of the Apostle and the feebleness of his converts. It is a term at once of affection and rebuke."—R.] It is more natural to make a break here (the very suddenness of the appeal implies this) and to join "my little children" with "tell me" (ver. 21). It cannot at all events be connected with the preceding context, but the connection with ver. 20 is only possible on the assumption of an interruption of the discourse (comp, δέ). [The presence of δέ in ver. 20 is urged as a reason for connecting our verse very closely with ver. 18, as is done by many commentators. The course of the thought would then be: "I have a right to ask for constancy in your affections. I have a greater claim on you than these new teachers. They speak but as strangers to strangers; I as a mother to her children with whom she has travailed" (Lightfoot). But there is something so sudden in the address, that it is better to separate the verses (so Meyer, Alford, Ellicott).—R.] On the other hand the contents of ver. 20 fit very well into the discourse as a parenthetical remark. In the "am again in travail" the wish presses itself upon him, rather to be present with them—and this he then expresses—before going on, in ver. 21, to attempt to change the minds of his readers, as being his children, and to bring them back. It is true "tell me," after this interruption, does not connect immediately with ver. 19; the "little children" receives a particular definition in "ye that desire to be under the law," but this only indicates how far a travailing again is necessary, in order to prepare for a continuance of this ὠδίνειν through the following exposition, as indeed all that precedes had been nothing else than such a travail.

[This view of the connection of the passage is open to serious objection. Two vocatives are joined together, which are separated both in position and in tone. Ver. 20 which contains the wish to be present is sundered from ver. 18, where the thought of his presence is introduced. The idea of travailing is joined to a passage of argument by illustration, and separated from the more personal part of the discourse. If there be a difficulty about δέ (ver. 20) as introducing an "opposition," and hence a parenthesis be deemed necessary, this "opposition" may be found (Meyer) "in the tacit contrast between the subject of his wish to be present with them, and his actual absence and separation." It seems best then to connect vers. 19 and 20 together—detaching them as a burst of tenderness from both the preceding and subsequent context, though joined in thought more closely with the former.—R.]

With whom I am again in travail.—*i. e.*, the second time.—The labor of his spirit on the hearts of the readers he here compares with the travail of a mother (elsewhere with the begetting of the father), in which the point of comparison is the activity directed to the coming of a child into the world; with the mother—of a natural child; here with the Apostle—of a spiritual child. This image is continued with the expression until Christ be formed in you.—It is a ripe, completely developed child that is in contemplation=in which the life has come to perfect manifestation. Such a child, and only such a one, renders a mother's pangs of labor effectual, for only such a child lives, and therefore only in such a one has she a child. So long as the birth is not that of a perfect child, so long must she ever look forward to new pangs of labor, before she can have this, her wish granted. [Ellicott: "The idea is not so much of the pain, as of the long and continuous effort of the travail."—R.]—With justice therefore is the complete formation of the child represented as the aim of the labor, and there is here nothing like an inversion of the physiological process, in which the *formatio* takes place *ante partum*. This is not here the point in question. The natural child is completely developed, in that the natural life, as it were the spirit of life, comes in it to perfect manifestion, gains an actual, corresponding form. What this natural spirit of life is in the natural child, Christ is in the spiritual child, as the principle of spiritual life, and hence the expression of the Apostle: Christ is μορφωθῆναι in them =the inward principle is to come with them to manifestation to gain a form in an established, assured, evangelical conviction of faith; only when this takes place, has Paul as spiritual mother actually a spiritual child. But since this is wanting, as is shown by their apostacy, he is therefore now bearing them once again, in the hope that this perfect formation may come to pass. (If it had not, he would have needed to travail in birth still again, but here, as is natural, he only speaks of a second travail.) That in nature a completely developed child is not hoped for from a second bearing of the same child, is a self-evident incongruity between the fact and the image, but it answers the purpose that the activity is the same—in both cases there is a

travail of birth.*—WIESELER incorrectly finds in πάλιν ὠδίνειν the doctrinal conception of the new birth, and takes πάλιν therefore as antithetical to the natural birth. In the first place the Apostle's lamentation over the alteration that had taken place in the readers, brings almost necessarily to our thoughts the probability of a renewed activity among them; and secondly he could well designate the labor bestowed by him upon the Galatians as a bearing of spiritual children, but not as a regeneration in the doctrinal sense, for this appertains to God alone. Paul's travailing in birth with them, it is true, had as its end, their becoming regenerate children of God, but the one is not therefore to be identified with the other.

Ver. 20. **I could wish indeed to be present with you.**—[This rendering, though not literal, brings out the force of the passage, and the "tacit contrast" in δέ. See above.—R.]—**And to change my tone.**—This, in its immediate connection with a wish to be present with them, appears to signify: I should be glad to give my language such a form as suits with oral intercourse; from the written style, with its more formal, unpliable character, less suited to make an impression on the heart, I should be glad to pass over into oral discourse. But φωνὴν ἀλλάξαι does not on this account mean: to interchange discourse with any one=to converse together, as WIESELER singularly assumes. Why he should like to be with them, and to vary his discourse, he then expressly declares: **For I am perplexed about you.**—Ἐν, the perplexity has its ground chiefly in them, in their state of mind.† He knows not with what arguments he can find access to them and dispose them to a return. Therefore he thinks now he could more easily accomplish something by oral discourse with them. MEYER understands φωνὴν ἀλλάσσειν of a wish of Paul, instead of the rigorous tone used in his last visit, to essay a milder tone. But this is far from evident.—RIEGER justly remarks that in a certain sense Paul does immediately after in ver. 21 what he wishes in ver. 20, namely, varies the form of his language, and speaks as if he were present with them: λέγετέ μοι κ. τ. λ. [For the various interpretations of the phrase "change my voice" see MEYER *in loco*. The view given above seems tame, but the reference to the tone during his second visit is doubtful. So also the interpretation: "to modify my language from time to time as occasion demands." Certainly it is improper to think of a desire to change his tone to a more severe one (in contrast with the mild τεκνία). On the whole it seems best to conclude 1) that the desired change was from the severe to the milder address; 2) that the severe tone referred to is that of the present Epistle (so ELLICOTT and many others).—R.]

Ver. 21. **Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?**—"Hear" is hardly to be taken precisely as implying that the law was publicly read by the pseudo-apostles among them, but generally: Do you not give heed to what is written in the Law? The second time νόμος, according to the Jewish use of תּוֹרָה = the Pentateuch. From the law itself, on which you lay so much stress, you might discover that you are not, and are not meant to be under the law. [MEYER:—"At the close of the theoretical part of his Epistle, Paul now appends a very peculiar *allegoric argument from the law itself*, intended to destroy the influence of the false Apostles with their own weapons, and to root it up out of its own proper soil."—R.]

Ver. 22. **For it is written.**—Γάρ = I must inquire: do ye not hear the Law; for if you really heard the law, you would find in it that which might convince you how unsound and dangerous it is to "desire to be under the law." That to which Paul refers the Galatians, as being found in the law, is the narrative in Genesis, of the two sons of Abraham, Ishmael and Isaac, the one by the bondmaid, Hagar, and the other by the free woman, Sarah. As is known, he had Ishmael first, and he is therefore mentioned first. They were therefore indeed both Abraham's sons, but they had not merely different mothers, but mothers also of entirely different conditions; the one was the son of a bondmaid, the other of a free woman.

Ver. 23. Yet even with that they might have been begotten in like manner, **but** (ἀλλά) this was far from being the case, the son of the bondmaid was begotten **after the flesh**, and the son of the free woman **through the promise.**—Κατὰ σάρκα = entirely in the ordinary way of natural generation, of carnal intercourse; διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας = formally also, it is true, in this way, but materially (by the side of which the other is a vanishing factor), by virtue of the divine promise, which Abraham had received, inasmuch as God in a miraculous manner, restored the long-lost capacity of Sarah to conceive, so that in truth the efficient factor was God. [The preposition διά denoting the *causa medians* (ELLICOTT).—R.]

Ver. 24. **Which things are allegorical,** ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα.—Paul thus introduces his interpretation of the narrative which he quotes. He states what the Galatians might learn from it. [ELLICOTT has a valuable note on the distinction between ὅς and ὅστις. His view of ἅτινα is thus expressed: "*all which things* viewed in their most general light." This wider meaning will guard against the assumption that the narrative itself was a mere allegory and not historical.—R.]—Ἀλληγορεῖν = ἄλλο ἀγορεύειν: to say something else than is expressed by the letter, to say something in figures; passively: to have a tropical sense, ἀλληγορούμενον εἶναι = to be something that has such a sense. That Paul understands what is related in Genesis of Abraham, Hagar, Sarah, etc., as history also, needs no proof: but undoubtedly at the same time he

* [WORDSWORTH mentions a curious exposition and extension of this metaphor in the Epistle of the primitive churches of Gaul "who say that by means of the martyrs much joy accrued to the holy Virgin Mother, the Church of Christ, receiving back *alive* those whom she has lost as abortions, and also because through means of the martyrs, very many of her children who had fallen away by apostasy, were again conceived in her womb, and were being brought forth again to life."—R.]

† [Hence ἀπορυῦμαι is to be taken, not as passive, with deponent sense (ELLICOTT), nor middle (LIGHTFOOT), but middle with passive signification (MEYER, ALFORD); "the condition of perplexity is conceived of as wrought upon, suffered by the subject."—R.]

sees in the history an intimation of something else, something higher, than the simple history relates. In what sense, see below, in the DOCTRINAL NOTES. [The precise meaning of ἀλληγορεῖν must be noted. It *may* be made to cover the thought: to be treated as having an allegorical sense, but here we must insist on the more definite and strict meaning: to have an allegorical sense. "Which things viewed in their most general light *have* an allegorical meaning;" this interpretation will guard against the assumptions and errors which are based upon a looser view. See DOCTRINAL NOTES.—R.]

To what the history points is then stated: **for these are two covenants.**—Αὗται seems not to refer immediately, *i. e.*, grammatically, to the women, but, according to ordinary Greek usage, to stand for ταῦτα; it would be somewhat different if in ver. 23 the women were the subjects. Substantially no doubt it refers to the two women, in whom he sees types of the two covenants—not however in the twofold marriage covenant of Abraham with Hagar and Sarah (as JATHO assumes, who, in order to sustain this view, is obliged to give an exceedingly forced interpretation of "which is Agar"). It is peculiar, and renders the understanding of this passage somewhat difficult, that Paul, in the first place, designates the women and not the sons themselves as symbols, more particularly as prophetic symbols of the two covenants; and in the second place, it even more perplexes the matter, that he finds in them the two *covenants* = of God with men, which were typified or prophesied (that is, in general, the Old and the New Covenant), and takes these themselves as mothers, and then from these first passes over to the two diverse *churches*, whose motherhood appears more clearly when viewed in connection with their members. Of course, however, the covenants stand in intimate relation to the churches; it is not only they that confer on them their peculiar character, but also that properly constitute them; without the covenants the churches would not exist.—**The one from Mount Sinai**, *etc.*—A pregnant expression = the first covenant is that which originates from mount Sinai and bears unto bondage. Γεννῶσα, feminine, because it corresponds to the mother Hagar. The expression εἰς δουλείαν γεννῶσα is itself to be supplemented so that it = bearing, *sc.* children, as it were into bondage = and translating them into bondage, of course by subjection to the law, for the covenant from Sinai is the covenant of law.—**Which is Hagar.**—This is = this covenant is typified by Hagar, for she too as "bondmaid" bore children "unto bondage." This is of course primarily the ground why he compares the Sinaitic covenant with Hagar; of both alike the "bearing children unto bondage" was an attribute. But this abrupt assertion: the Sinaitic covenant is Hagar, or, Hagar signifies the Sinaitic covenant, because it as well as she "bore unto bondage," is of itself too bold and startling, and Paul therefore in a parenthesis intimates that Sinai and Hagar, far apart as they might seem to be, yet even independently of this "bearing," stand *of themselves* related to one another.

VER. 25. The words setting forth this relation are, according to one reading: τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ: according to the other: τὸ δὲ [or γάρ] Ἄγαρ Σινᾶ ὄρος, &c. Accepting the first reading, Paul points to the fact that Mount Sinai is situated in Arabia—that therefore the Sinaitic covenant has one home with Hagar, and so far a relation to her. Both originate from Arabia—are not at home in the Holy Land; while yet they both came in near relation to the people of God; Hagar to Abraham, bearing him a son; the Sinaitic covenant to Abraham's posterity, raising up children to this; for Israel by the Sinaitic covenant first became an organized theocratic people, possessing the principle of self-preservation and hereditary continuance.—Accepting the reading: τὸ δὲ Ἄγαρ, κ. τ. λ. in which δέ is exceedingly well suited to introduce an elucidation, which indeed it properly is, rather than a demonstration [γάρ being however the more probable reading, on critical grounds, see critical note.—R.], the Apostle points out that even as to name there exists a relation between Hagar and the Sinaitic covenant,—that it is not therefore so arbitrary as might seem on his part, to interpret the former as a type of the latter; for that among the Arabians, Mount Sinai has just this name of Hagar, and that—as Paul undoubtedly assumes—after Hagar. It is true we have no other proof of Sinai's having this appellation, and it would have to be assumed that Paul had learned, perhaps from his sojourn in Arabia, that Sinai bore this name also among the Arabs, which he referred back to Hagar. It is certainly probable, that the Arabs named Sinai Ἄγαρ; for this is = Rock, and so corresponds precisely to the character of this mountain chain, and probably also to the signification of the ancient name "Sinai" itself, which etymology renders by "Rock."—Paul would then, only err in the reference of this name Ἄγαρ to the Hagar of the Old Testament, but at all events the name would be the same, and this, in the first instance would be the main thing. Yet this circumstance will always make this reading suspicious.

[In addition to these interpretations, which may be distinguished as I., II., another (III.) must be considered, *viz.*, that of CALVIN, BEZA, ESTIUS, WORDSWORTH (and LIGHTFOOT, if the correctness of the Recepta be established): "For this Hagar (is) represents Mount Sinai in Arabia."—I. is comparatively free from grammatical difficulty, forming a parenthesis, which introduces a *geographical* remark, the point of which is obvious, though on the whole it seems much tamer than the other views. Besides the *critical* grounds for preferring the longer reading (not the least strong being this absence of grammatical difficulties), it may be objected 1. That since a *mere* geographical remark would be unnecessary, the emphasis must lie on ἐν τῇ Ἀραβ.; but to convey such an emphasis, the Greek order should be ἐν τῇ Ἀρ. ἐστίν (ALFORD). 2. MEYER intimates that this view must press as the essential point, the fact that the mountain was "outside of the land of Canaan," and yet this essential point is only implied. Still there is not much force in this objection, since the positive statement "is in Arabia," the land of bondsmen, is after all the main thought, the other being a negative antitheses, that may well be omitted.—II. is adopted by MEYER, ELLICOTT, ALFORD, and many older

commentators (CHRYSOSTOM, LUTHER, *et al*). This may be called the *etymological* view. Here the grammatical difficulties are not great, for it may readily be conceded, that τὸ Ἄγαρ means "the word Agar," ἐστίν, "means"—and ἐν τῇ Ἀρ. either "among the Arabians" or "in the Arabian (supply διαλέκτῳ) dialect," and the objection that "the word Agar" cannot properly be the subject of συστοιχεῖ is met by putting a semicolon at the end of this clause, or throwing it into a parenthesis. The real difficulties are far graver. 1. It is extremely doubtful whether "Agar" did mean "in Arabia, Mount Sinai." The testimony of travellers is not strong, that of philology even less so. Granting that the Arabic word for "rock" is similar in sound, we are far from settling the question of identity of name. 2. "If in writing to a half-Greek, half-Celtic people, he ventured to argue from an Arabic word at all, he would at all events be careful to make his drift intelligible" (LIGHTFOOT). Was it likely to be intelligible to them, when in these days of philological and geographical research, this interpretation is still doubtful? 3. The argument or illustration seems fanciful when resting on this identity of name, especially as Hagar had a meaning in Hebrew, and Sarah also, which meanings could well have been used here, were it a question of names.—III. "For this Hagar *represents*," *etc.* This may be called the *typical or allegorical* interpretation, and for that very reason more likely to be correct in this connection. It avoids the objections against I. on the score of emphasis, and tameness; with II. follows the reading which seems more correct, but avoids the fanciful and doubtful features of that view. MEYER considers the neuter article an insuperable objection. But this may be met 1) as is done by WORDSWORTH, by joining the article with Σινᾶ ὄρος not with Ἄγαρ. He contends that this is allowable and that no other order was admissible. Still this seems unnatural. Or 2) by understanding τὸ Ἄγαρ, "the thing Hagar," not the woman, for ver. 24 passes over into allegory, but the allegorical Hagar,—her position as set forth in ver. 24. This is less objectionable. As this is the only real difficulty (ἐστίν, "represents," is of course admissible), we may adopt III. as perhaps the safest view, seemingly that of E. V. As regards punctuation, a comma then suffices after this clause, and Ἄγαρ is the grammatical subject of συστοιχεῖ.—R.]

Ranks with.—Συστοιχεῖ δέ might be connected with ἥτις (ver. 24) or back of that with μία, *sc.* διαθήκη. [So DE WETTE, LIGHTFOOT.—R.] "For she is in bondage" is given as the proof of "ranks with," and this evidently refers to "bearing children unto bondage" (ver. 24). The covenant "bearing children unto bondage" "ranks with the present Jerusalem, for she is in bondage with her children." Συστοιχεῖν, to stand in one row with something else, to belong to the same species, to belong together with anything. The Sinaitic covenant, says Paul, and the present Jerusalem, although separated in time and place, yet belong essentially together; the former brought into "bondage," the latter is in that very bondage. The object is to show that an internal relation exists between the Sinaitic covenant and the present Jerusalem. [This is certainly preferable to the view of CHRYSOSTOM and most of the Fathers, LUTHER *et al.*, which takes Σινᾶ as the subject, and renders the verb either "is contiguous to" or "joined in a continuous (mountain) range" with Jerusalem. The thought is irrelevant, and we should then have Mt. Zion, rather than Jerusalem, following the verb. LIGHTFOOT thus shows the exact meaning of the verb: "In military language συστοιχία denotes a *file*, as συζυγία does a rank of soldiers; comp. Polyb. x. 21, 7. The allegory of the text may be represented by συστοιχίαι thus:

Hagar, the bond woman.	Sarah, the free woman.
Ishmael, the child after the flesh.	Isaac, the child of promise.
The Old Covenant.	The New Covenant.
The earthly Jerusalem, etc.	The heavenly Jerusalem, etc."

Accepting this meaning, it is necessary to take exception to embracing the idea of type in the word. Those in each list are σύστοιχοι with each other, but ἀντίστοιχοι to those in the opposite list.—R.]—It seems however more accordant with the context to make Ἄγαρ (ver. 25) the subject. For Hagar is a type of the present Jerusalem, "ranks with"—stands in the same row with it, or better, fits as a type to the antitype [?] Moreover Hagar *was* "in bondage with her children, just as the present Jerusalem." Besides in this connection there is significant reference to the fact that "the present Jerusalem" corresponds to Hagar alone—and not to Sarah: the special proof of which is, what is affirmed of "the present Jerusalem," viz.: "for she is in bondage with her children." [So that not only the proximity of the word Ἄγαρ, but the closer correspondence also, supports the view that "Hagar" is the logical subject of the verb. See MEYER.—R.]

The present Jerusalem.—Jerusalem represents here as it always did in the Old Testament, the Jewish people; but this as a collective personality, and moreover a maternal one, the individual members of the people being viewed as children of this mother. Ἡ νῦν Ἱερουσ. is the present Jerusalem in contrast with the μελλ. Ἱερουσ. as it shall become through the Messiah, *i. e.*, through faith in Him, the Jerusalem, which has not, and so long as it has not, received the Messiah. "The present Jerusalem" meaning thus the historical Israel, the Jewish people, its children are of course "born after the flesh" and Paul presupposes this as self-evident.—**Is in bondage.**—This cannot apply to the yoke of the Romans, for this has nothing at all to do with the Sinaitic covenant, but applies to the being in bondage under the Mosaic law. A state of bondage in this sense Paul predicates of the existing Jewish church without further proof, as something which the readers after the preceding exposition of the nature of the law (comp. iii. 23; iv. 3–7), must concede, and indeed that the Jews were strenuous observers of the law was a matter beyond doubt.

Ver. 26. **But Jerusalem which is above is free.**—Paul does not continue the course of thought begun in ver. 24 with "for these are two covenants." He names the first covenant only, not the second one also, but to make the contrast more palpable, opposes at once to the present Jerusalem, which is in bondage, another Jerusalem which is free. Now the present Jeru-

salem is in a condition of bondage because the first covenant, which is a covenant of bondage, came in her to manifestation. So the freedom of the other Jerusalem would have its ground also in the character of the second covenant, which comes into manifestation in her, and we have a right to find implied a second covenant bearing children unto freedom, which is typified prophetically by Sarah, just as the covenant of bondage by Hagar. If we inquire what this second covenant is, according to the previous context, the answer cannot be doubtful; over against the covenant of law stands a covenant of grace or promise. WIESELER's parallelism goes too far, where he wishes to supply: *δευτέρα δὲ (διαθήκη) ἀπὸ ὄρους Σιὼν, εἰς ἐλευθερίαν γεννῶσα, ἥτις ἐστὶ Σάῤῥα. τὸ γὰρ Σιὼν ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ γῇ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, συστοιχεῖ δὲ τῇ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ. ἐλευθέρη γάρ ἐστι μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.* ["The second covenant from Mount Zion, bearing children unto freedom, which is Sarah. For Zion is a mountain in the land of promise, and ranks with Jerusalem above, for she is free with her children." This follows from his view of ver. 25, and is objectionable besides for the reason that it forces an allegory beyond the point to which it has been carried by the Apostle himself.—R.] Somewhat too definite also is MEYER's view: The other covenant is the one established in Christ (see afterwards on *ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ*). Paul has not waited till now to give the proof that the covenant of grace is a covenant of promise, and that on this account Jerusalem above is also free. This is in part clear from what precedes and in part results from the nature of the case, since a covenant of promise given of grace, because it has nothing to do with any law, can have no connection with "bondage" either. In addition he now demonstrates to the Galatians this only, that *they* are children of *that* Jerusalem which is free, and that therefore it would be preposterous for them to wish to be under the law. "Free" of course =not being under the law.

The main question is, what *ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσ.* signifies. "Jerusalem" here also means a church taken as a collective personality, her individual members being conceived as her children. But *ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσ.* is of course not the "ancient" Jerusalem, the Salem of Melchisedek, nor yet the mountain of Zion, which in Josephus is called *ἡ ἄνω πόλις.* [LIGHTFOOT: "The Apostle instinctively prefers the Hebrew form *Ἱερουσαλὴμ* here for the typical city, as elsewhere in this Epistle (i. 17, 18; ii. 1) he employs the Græcised form *Ἱερόσόλυμα* for the actual city. '*Ἱερουσαλὴμ est appellatio Hebraica, originaria et sanctior: Ἱεροσόλυμα, deinceps obvia, Græca, magis politica,*' says Bengel on Rev. xxi. 2, accounting for the usage of St. John (in the Gospel the latter; in the Apocalypse the former), and referring to this passage in illustration."—R.] On the other hand LUTHER is right in his decided protest against the reference to the *ecclesia triumphans*, for the Christians of this world are here designated by Paul as children of this *ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ*. (Only so much is correct, that with the *παρουσία* it is no other than this very *ἄνω Ἱερουσ.* that comes to perfection, so that the Church after the *παρουσία* is essentially identical with that before it. But the eye is not at all directed here to the *παρουσία*; and the very reason why the expression *ἡ μέλλουσα Ἱερουσ.* is not chosen is, that after Christ had appeared upon earth this must be referred to the *παρουσία*. WIESELER is therefore also incorrect in asserting not only that the church of the perfected is meant, but in insisting as he does that these are *expressly* comprehended.)—But yet *ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσ.* must at all events signify a Jerusalem that is above, an *upper* Jerusalem, and this "above" can only refer to Heaven. Here again LUTHER has a right understanding of it, in the main point at all events, when he remarks that this "above" is to be understood not of place but of character: "when St. Paul speaks of a Jerusalem above and the other here below upon earth, he means that the one Jerusalem is spiritual, but the other earthly. For there is a great distinction between spiritual and corporeal or earthly things. What is spiritual, that is above, but what is earthly, that is here below. Therefore says he then, that the spiritual Jerusalem is above, not that in respect to space or place it is higher than the earthly here below, but in that it is spiritual." The upper Jerusalem would therefore=the spiritual Jerusalem. This explanation, it is true, does not appear to do full justice to the material idea "above," but it leads in the right direction for this, and needs only to be completed by including also the conception of space which is contained in *ἄνω*. That is, *ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσ.* is not= the Jerusalem that is *localiter*, externally situated above (this is refuted by LUTHER), but the Jerusalem, that as to its *essential character* is an upper, heavenly one, and therefore neither originates from earth nor belongs to earth, but originates from Heaven and belongs to Heaven, let it be situated where it may, of which nothing is expressly said. (In reality Luther also means this and nothing else by his spiritual Jerusalem, and his explanation, therefore, only apparently incurs the reproach of spiritualizing.) Whether the expression is immediately founded upon the rabbinical doctrine of the ירושלים של מעלה "which according to Jewish teaching is the archetype existing in Heaven of the earthly Jerusalem, and at the establishment of the Messianic kingdom will be let down from Heaven to earth, in order, as the earthly Jerusalem is the central point and the capital of the old theocracy, to be the same for the Messianic theocracy" (MEYER), cannot be affirmed with certainty; that Paul did not share the crude and sensuous rabbinical conceptions of this heavenly Jerusalem, but had a scripturally purified idea of it, is in any case clear; so that from the Jewish schools he only derives the expression rather than the substance of the idea. At the most he had only the fundamental conception, which was then essentially modified. [LIGHTFOOT: "With them," *i. e.*, the rabbinical teachers, "it is an actual city, the exact counterpart of the earthly Jerusalem in its topography and furniture: with him it is a symbol or image, representing that spiritual city of which the Christian is even now a denizen (Phil. iii. 20). The contrast between the two scenes, as they appeared to the eye, would enhance, if it did not suggest the imagery of St. Paul here. On the one hand, Mount Zion, of old the joy of the whole

earth, now more beautiful than ever in the fresh glories of the Herodian renaissance, glittering in gold and marble; on the other, Sinai with its rugged peaks and barren sides, bleak and desolate, the oppressive power of which the Apostle himself had felt during his sojourn there—these scenes fitly represented the contrast between the glorious hopes of the new covenant and the blank despair of the old. Comp Heb. xii. 18–22."—R.]

And she is our mother.—If we seek to define still more distinctly the idea of the *ἄνω Ἱερουσ.*, we shall find that here also LUTHER had the right sense of it, when he peremptorily declares, and in opposition to the transcendental fantasies, which overlooked the actually operative heavenly forces in the word and sacraments, so strongly insists that: "the heavenly Jerusalem, which is above, is nothing else than the dear church or Christendom, that are in the whole world here and there dispersed, who all together have one gospel, one manner of faith in Christ, one Holy Ghost, and one manner of sacrament." Only here again he makes the idea too special. The upper Jerusalem, which essentially springs from Heaven and not from earth, and belongs to Heaven and not to earth, is in the first instance nothing else than the true Church and people of God in its entire generality; for this has its constitution not in the covenant of law, but in the covenant of grace or promise, and its essential character may therefore with full right, nay must be denominated by Paul a heavenly one.—As certainly now as Paul dated back the covenant of grace as far back beyond the covenant of law as Abraham's time, so certainly did this "upper Jerusalem" properly begin with Abraham himself, although at first indeed rather in the way of promise, in idea, as it were, but yet *realiter*, as certainly as God's covenant of grace was one really concluded. This "upper Jerusalem" then, it is true, first came to full manifestation with the advent of the Messiah, as with this God's covenant of grace first found its true actualization; and so far is the upper Jerusalem=Christendom, but yet even now it must not be identified with it. It is a higher, more general idea, precisely =God's congregation [*Gottesgemeinde*] which the idea of the church does not altogether exhaust, but which continues to rise above it, lying at the foundation of the church, which is its concrete manifestation, but yet to be distinguished from it; and indeed this idea of the congregation of God will never attain its completely adequate expression in the church of this dispensation, but only with the *παρουσία* will such a complete coincidence of ideas and phenomenon be realized (as indeed on the other hand the present Jerusalem which is in bondage was also not absolutely coincident with the Jewish community, but many members of it raised themselves above this bondage, although no doubt in this case the coincidence was far more nearly complete). [MEYER's interpretation: "the *Messianic theocracy*, which before the *παρουσία* is the *church*, and after it Christ's kingdom of glory" is substantially correct, provided we sufficiently extend the meaning of the word "Church." Our conceptions of her, "who is our mother," must here be large enough to include all her children, in the Old and the New Dispensations, as militant and triumphant. See DOCTRINAL NOTES.—R.] What Paul now wishes to show is, that Christians are children of this true congregation of God, that is grounded upon the covenant of grace, and therefore of course is free, and not merely that they are children of the Christian community, which certainly would have needed no proof.—From the foregoing we see still more evidently (what has already been touched upon above), that the expression *ἡ μέλλουσα Ἱερουσ.*, although it would have corresponded with *ἡ νῦν Ἱερουσ.*, would not have been suitable here. On the other hand nothing stood in the way of designating the natural Israel as *ἡ νῦν Ἱερουσ.*, inasmuch as every one would refer this expression to the right object; in this sense a *κάτω Ἱερουσ.* would have sounded strange, and would have been less intelligible, so that the want of correspondence in the expressions is not at all surprising.

Vers. 27 and 28 contain the proof of the proposition that "Jerusalem which is above" is the mother of Christians,—in syllogistic form, only not quite exact, since *ὑμεῖς* is the more probable reading in ver. 28. Ver. 27, major premise: To the "Jerusalem which is above," although she does not bear, there are many children promised, who therefore, as Isaac, must have been born purely in virtue of Divine promise.—Ver. 28, minor premise: But now are we, or rather, says the Apostle, with definite application to the readers, for whom particularly the proof is intended, ye are the children of promise, after the analogy of Isaac;—therefore (conclusion) ye are children of the Jerusalem above.

For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not, *etc.*—For the major premise Paul appeals to Isaiah liv. 1. The theocratic nation is addressed during the Babylonian exile, and told that though aforetime in the bloom of Israel's prosperity she was like a woman "who hath a husband," who had by her husband numerous children, she now resembled a woman that is "desolate" = without a husband (for it had been repudiated by God), and in consequence —for *στεῖρα* is here to be taken in this sense—is "barren," "not bearing," "not travailing," bears no children. (God is to be conceived as the husband, if this part of the figure is also to be interpreted, according to the familiar Biblical image of God's marriage covenant with Israel.) But yet is she to rejoice, and loudly to express her joy (*ῥῆξον sc. φωνήν, rumpe vocem*, let loose the voice), for she shall become richer in children than before! This therefore not in the way of natural generation, but through the immediate extraordinary operation of God: they are therefore children not "after the flesh," but born "through the promise." (Only, so to speak, the natural, carnal relation of God to the people as begetting natural posterity, was dissolved; God yet remained, in the exercise of a higher energy, devoted to the people as His people, for the very end of bringing in something higher than before.) Evidently in this the image of Sarah hovers before the prophet, of that barren one who was "desolate," that is, at least as "barren" could have no conjugal intercourse with her husband, and therefore was so far without husband, and who yet became a mother of a numerous progeny in virtue of the Divine en-

ergy. Thus even the prophet sees in Sarah a type of the theocratic nation—not, it is true, in her condition of freedom, but at least in her becoming a mother by promise, and therefore is she a type of the theocratic people, inasmuch as this increases not in the natural way=through natural descent, but through the addition of spiritual children.—Herein also is found Paul's justification for referring this passage immediately to "Jerusalem which is above." Primarily, indeed, it applies to the theocratic people as a whole. But even here, to the natural children, =to such as become members of the theocratic people by natural descent, are opposed spiritual children=such as become such in virtue of Divine operation, without natural consanguinity. The sense therefore cannot be merely: The now depopulated Israel shall again become populous, yea, even more than before, by renewal of the now interrupted conjugal intimacy; but from *that* people of God which increased by natural descent, there is distinguished the people of God in the higher, completely true sense, whose existence does not depend on natural descent, but on Divine operation, that is of course, the operation of the Spirit, inasmuch as God through His Spirit produces faith, and *so* raises up children to His people, regarded as mother, or to Abraham their first ancestor. There is thus contrasted with the natural, empirical people of God, the one *ἔχουσα τὸν ἄνδρα*, which is now continued in the present Jerusalem, a higher spiritual one, the one which is "barren, bearing not,"=not naturally maintaining and increasing itself, *i. e.*, in short the "Jerusalem which is above."—The fulfilment of the promise then, took place, *i. e.*, numerous children, without being naturally begotten by the theocratic people, were born to it, in particular, through the appearance of the Messiah, for all, who came to believe on Him, became thereby, and not by natural descent, members of God's people (comp. ver. 28).—But it must here be remarked in addition, that Paul's design is not strictly to declare positively of the Jerusalem above (as even MEYER assumes), that it had first been barren, therefore first unpopulated, childless, and had then become the mother of children (with the origin of the Christian people of God); but he means thereby only to distinguish it from the theocratic people that is maintained and continued by natural means. In distinction from this the Jerusalem above is in its *nature*—and *remains* therefore barren, not bearing, not travailing, desolate, for she obtains children indeed, but by no means through becoming fertile, *τίκτειν, ὠδίνειν* = not by such natural processes, as if these had only failed for awhile, and had then again become operative; on the other hand the children are given to her in a way not to be naturally explained, not as bodily offspring, but spiritually by Divine operation; for she is and remains not "having a husband" (=who does not stand to God in this natural and carnal relation). [ALFORD:—The "husband" of the E. V. may mislead "by pointing at the one husband (Abraham) who was common to Sara and Agar, which might do in this passage, but not in Isaiah: whereas *ἔχ. τὸν ἄνδρα* means, 'her (of the two) who has (the) husband,' the other having none: a fineness of meaning which we cannot give in English." This goes to sustain the view of Schmoller.—R.] We need not be perplexed because this would create a divergence from the type of Sarah, with whom certainly, after her barrenness, a bearing and travailing took place. But although Paul undoubtedly knew this well, he yet (vers. 23, 29) denies explicitly and roundly that Isaac was born after the flesh and vindicates to him only a being born through the promise, after the Spirit; and he can very well apprehend the contrast thus absolutely, because he looks only at the essential thing, the determining, generative principle, and this was purely "the promise," "the spirit," even though the act did not proceed without the medium of the "flesh." Sarah, is his meaning, did not obtain her son Isaac, because from a naturally unfruitful woman she had become a naturally fruitful one; her obtaining the son was therefore only, as it were, formally, not essentially, a *τίκτειν*, &c. (see on ver. 23). But if Paul expresses himself thus even respecting Sarah, with whom nevertheless in a certain sense a *τίκτειν*, and the like, did take place, the same of course holds good in its full sense of the antitype, the true people of God, as Jerusalem above. This is precisely its specific quality, that it obtains children without "bearing" as "barren," and in this very way approves itself as the true people of God, for which God begets children; therefore we have only: "many are the children of the desolate," not: she will *bear* many children. Of course "barren" varies a little; at first it is one who *cannot* bear, because she is deprived of the husband; but from that it becomes one, who does not bear and *is* to bear, *i. e.*, does not in this way obtain children, and is to obtain them, but in another way. But this variation is already implied in the original sense of the passage, which as it were says: "Barren hast thou become, that cannot bear; well, so shalt thou be and remain, but not to thy hurt, but to thy good," &c.—**Many are the children of the desolate more**, *etc.*—MEYER rightly explains: not=*πλείονα ἤ*, which would leave the numerousness of the children wholly undetermined, but it expresses, that both have many children, but the solitary one, more=numerous are the children of the solitary, far more, than of her who hath her husband.

Ver. 28 places the Galatians, as Christians, among the children of the Jerusalem above, promised her in ver. 27. **As Isaac was.**—*Κατὰ Ἰσαάκ*, in conformity with, according to the type of, even as Isaac. The antitype of the mother, Sarah, was named ver. 26; even so are Christians antitypes of *her* son, Isaac.—**Children of Promise.**—opposed to *σαρκὸς τέκνα*, therefore properly children whom the promise has born=who are born in virtue of the promise of God, not through carnal generation. —So was it with Isaac; he was born to Abraham as son in this way. Even so is it with you: you have in this way been born, *i. e.*, become *members of God's people.* This needs no proof, for on one side, it was certain that they as Christians were members of God's people, and on the other side also, hat they were not so by

nature, by carnal descent, but in a spiritual manner, namely, through their knowledge of Christ, to which God had led them by His Spirit, thereby fulfilling His promise. It therefore follows from this, that they belong, because members of the theocratic people, and yet not such by natural descent, to "the children of the desolate" (ver. 27)=have her (to whom, although desolate, children are promised by God) as their mother, as was affirmed in ver. 26.

Ver. 29. **Still as then he that was born after the flesh.**—Why will you nevertheless be under the law, and so in the condition of bondage? Paul had brought home to his hearers, You are like Isaac, not like Ishmael. This he had deduced from the manner of the birth of each. But now he adds—looking at the subsequent lot of each—a warning, that it is dangerous to place themselves in a position like Ishmael's, for he had been shut out of the inheritance. Even so will it fare—Paul gives them to understand, with those that are like Ishmael=those that are under the law. Ἀλλά: for the thought which Paul first expresses, is in opposition to that in the foregoing verse, where he had described Christians as having a possession, as children of the free woman, because children of the promise. Yet Paul does not affirm this in order to frighten them back from the condition of freedom, as one of persecution, but on the contrary (ἀλλά, ver. 30) in order to set forth immediately after the evil lot of the children of the bondwoman, as persecutors, and thus to hinder the Christians from placing themselves, through bondage to the law, in a like position with them.

Persecuted.—In Gen. xxi. 9, Ishmael is mentioned only as a scoffer: Paul here then either uses *διώκειν* in a more general sense, or he follows a more developed tradition, traces of which are found in the Rabbins. [*Διώκειν* is a strong word, and we are not justified in altering or extending its meaning to meet a difficulty, arising from the interpretation of another passage. The question then is: Is this statement of the Apostle based only upon the Scriptural narrative (Gen. xxi. 9), or also upon some other reliable source of information, supplementing the Old Testament narrative. The chief objection urged by most modern commentators against the former of these views is, that there is no thought of "persecution" either expressed or implied in the passage referred to. It tells us of Ishmael's "laughing" (מְצַחֵק: which the LXX. expands into *παίζοντα μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς*"); this has been interpreted as *in play* awakening Sarah's jealousy, and as *in mockery*, arousing her anger. Obviously the latter is more in accordance with the context and is a legitimate rendering of the Hebrew (see LANGE'S *Com.* Gen. *in loco*). But is it said that even this view of the narrative will not justify the assertion "persecuted." WORDSWORTH, accepting the meaning "playing," remarks: "The temper in which Ishmael played with Isaac, may best be inferred from the comment which Isaac's mother made upon it. Sarah's words interpret Ishmael's act. If his play had been loving play, she would not have been displeased by it. It must have been the spirit of spiteful malice, made more offensive by its pretence to sportiveness and love,* which extorted from Sarah the words which the Holy Spirit, speaking by St. Paul, here calls a verdict of Scripture. And Almighty God Himself vouchsafed to confirm Sarah's interpretation of Ishmael's play, by commanding Abraham, although reluctant, to hearken to Sarah's voice in that matter." It would seem that an inspired Apostle, reading the Old Testament narrative in the full gospel light, could interpret the spirit of that occurrence, without relying on *tradition*. If however the objection urged by MEYER, DE WETTE, JOWETT, and others, be deemed valid, as even ELLICOTT admits them to be, the following remarks of LIGHTFOOT may well be taken into account. "1) This incident which is so lightly sketched in the original narrative had been drawn out in detail in later traditions, and thus a prominence was given to it, which would add force to the Apostle's allusion, without his endorsing these traditions himself. 2) The relations between the two brothers were reproduced in their descendants. The aggressions of the Arab tribes on the Israelites were the antitype to Ishmael's mockery of Isaac. Thus in Ishmael the Apostle may have indirectly contemplated Ishmael's progeny; and he would therefore be appealing to the national history of the Jews in saying 'he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit.'"—R.]

After the Spirit.—The one born according to the Spirit. The Spirit of God was the power by which the generation of Isaac took place. The Spirit however is here conceived not as the power, but as the norm, according to which the generation took place=he was begotten in the way and manner in which the Spirit begets. "After the flesh" is to be interpreted in the same way.

Even so now.—Those born after the Spirit ="the children of promise" are persecuted by those born after the flesh=the natural members of the theocratic people, the Jews. But the main point is not the suffering of persecution by the one, although the thought of it occasions the ἀλλά, but the persecution of the others. See ver. 30.—To what this specially refers, is hard to say: that there was no lack of persecutions on the part of the Jews, is indeed well known. That the plotting of the Judaizers against the Christians are also meant, is probable; for these Judaizers believed themselves to have a preëminence, precisely as those born after the flesh, and, as our whole Epistle shows, took a position, which though professedly in the interest of others' salvation, was nevertheless really hostile towards those who were only "born after the Spirit," or only set a value on this, and denied to them a title to membership among the people of God. A similar self-exaltation over others and a disposition to suppress them, took place also, he says, in the case of Ishmael with respect to Isaac. But it turned out the other way.

[WORDSWORTH: "St. Paul's comparison here is peculiarly apposite and relevant to the subject before him. The Judaizers, with whom he is dealing in this Epistle, were like Ishmael, the

* [AUGUSTINE: *Sed lusum Paulus persecutionem vocat, quia lusio illa illusio erat.*—R.]

son of the bondwoman Agar, the representative of the Old Covenant not spiritually understood. They professed friendship for the Galatian Christians, who were the spiritual Isaac. In semblance they were *playing* with the offspring of the free woman, but in reality they were *persecuting* him. The Judaizers were endeavoring to rob the Galatian Christians of their Evangelical inheritance derived from Abraham. Thus Ishmael pretended to be playing with Isaac, but was in fact persecuting him. The Apostle, therefore, who had just been comparing himself to an affectionate mother, comes forward as a vigilant *Sarah*, and interferes to part the Jewish Ishmael from the Christian Isaac; and to rescue the children of the promise and of freedom from the treacherous flattery and tyrannical sport of the children of the flesh and of bondage." This beautiful comparison is of course marred by any reference to tradition in our verse.—R.]

Ver. 30. **Cast out the bondwoman and her son,** *etc*—Paul here cites the words of Sarah Gen. xxi. 10 according to the LXX., only instead of *μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ μου Ἰσαάκ*, he substitutes, because the expression is severed from the context, *μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρας;* therewith stating expressly the meaning of Sarah; for it is from this very point of view, namely, that her son is the son of the free woman, that she comes forward so decidedly against Ishmael, as the son of the bondmaid, declares that he is not entitled to be co-heir with her son, and demands his expulsion. It is not the personal behavior of Ishmael therefore which she urges against him, but his position, although, it is true, she is moved to do it by his behavior. As he is in himself not entitled to be co-heir, this right possessed against him is now urged—and as the narrative shows, made good. The application with an "even so now," Paul leaves to the readers as being obvious, because through the whole argument he desires that they themselves may see the perverseness of the position which they are on the point of assuming. It would be thus supplied: Even so now—will it fare with the children of the bondmaid; they have as little right of inheritance as the son of the bondmaid had then, and this want of title will be brought into force against them on account of their persecution (so that in this particular also they will prove themselves antitypes of Hagar and Ishmael). The reference to the expulsion of these does not as yet apply immediately to the readers, but if they suffer themselves to be made children of the bondmaid—and what that signifies is clear—by going over to the legal Jewish position, they lose at all events their *right* of inheritance, and are on the way to lose also the inheritance itself. Paul specifies the persecution primarily because the Divine exclusion from the inheritance was historically occasioned by that. A searching admonition, "to hear the law better" (ver. 21)=to take better note of the intimations which are contained therein—and therefore not to place themselves under the law.

[Lightfoot: "Shall in nowise inherit! The Law and the Gospel cannot coexist; the Law must disappear before the Gospel. It is scarcely possible to estimate the strength of conviction and depth of prophetic insight which this declaration implies. The Apostle thus confidently sounds the death-knell of Judaism at a time when one-half of Christendom clung to the Mosaic law with a jealous affection little short of frenzy, and while the Judaic party seemed to be growing in influence and was strong enough, even in the Gentile churches of his own founding, to undermine his influence and endanger his life. The truth which to us appears a truism must then have been regarded as a paradox."—R.]

The course of thought begun in ver. 21, concludes therefore with our verse in a complete and satisfactory way: Take heed then to the law, and learn from it: (1) that ye *are* free as Christians and (2) that ye, if ye do not persevere in this freedom, forfeit the inheritance—so that necessarily the conclusion must be drawn with ver. 30, and ver. 31 cannot be viewed as an immediate deduction from what precedes, nor as a conclusion, but only as a sentence summing up once more the foregoing result and introducing a transition to what follows, on which account it is to be joined with it.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The personal relation between teacher and congregation.* The significance which attaches to the personal relation between teacher and congregation (see on the former section, the first remark), comes most evidently to view in this, that the teacher must regard it as his commission, to beget spiritual children (and that truly living ones)—as father, nay, yet more: to bear them also—as mother. There is thus of necessity constituted an inner bond of personal fellowship between him and the souls on which he labors; but it is true, the existence of such a bond is not to be presupposed as a matter of course, or demanded even where the condition of such a loving labor of spiritual begetting and bearing is wanting.

2. "*Christ is formed* (1) in the understanding of man, when he receives a truly living and spiritual knowledge of Christ's person, offices, and benefits; (2) in the will of man, when (*a*) in regeneration faith in Christ is not only kindled, but also attains to its fit form, so that he hangs simply and solely on Christ, which faith then in justification apprehends and puts on Christ, and unites itself inwardly with Him; (*b*) in renewal, when Christ's Divine mind is daily more and more formed in men, so that the lineaments of Christ's image become ever more discernible.—It reads moreover: Till Christ be formed in you, not, Till you or I form Him in you, because regeneration is no human work."—Starke.

3. *The allegory.* What view are we to hold of the interpretation of the two wives and sons of Abraham in this section? Is Paul a representative of that allegorical interpretation which presupposing a double, yes, multiplex sense of the Biblical text, long prevailed in the church, to the prejudice of the sound historical understanding of the contents of Scripture? The appearance is strongly for it, but in truth it is not so. Paul to be sure allegorizes here, for he says so himself. But with the very fact of his saying this himself, the gravity of the hermeneutical difficulty disappears. He *means* therefore to give an allegory, not an exposition; he does not pro-

ceed as an exegete, and does not mean to say—after the manner of the allegorizing exegetes—that only what he now says is the true sense of the narrative, concealed in the letter, the only sense really worthy of God's word. The question then is only (1) whether this allegorical interpretation is merely a subjective fancy of the Apostle, or whether it is grounded in the actual facts; (2) what use he makes of this allegory. Commonly these two questions are not kept distinct from each other. Respecting the first, no one can speak of a mere arbitrary fancy (of a play of allegorical sharp-wittedness, rabbinism, and the like), who pays the least attention to the typical significance which according to Paul appertains to Abraham and his history,—and who allows any justice whatever in this the Apostle's view of Abraham. We well know that for Paul Abraham himself is typical by his faith, and in immediate connection with that, Isaac is typical by his birth through the power of the Divine promise, and not of the flesh; he is the type of the true children of Abraham, *i. e.*, of the true theocratic people, whose origin is not that of natural birth alone (comp. Rom. ix. 16 *sq.*). This of itself then gives on the other hand the converse, namely, the typical character of the carnal son, Ishmael. But now, in this section, Paul goes yet a step further. To him not only the manner of birth of the two sons of Abraham is typical, but also the condition in which they were born: the bondage of the one and the freedom of the other. Isaac is thus the type of a theocratic people, that (1) does not become such by natural birth, but by Divine operation; (2) and is also in possession of freedom, is the spiritual and free Israel; on the contrary Ishmael is the type of a merely natural and enslaved theocratic people: that is, the natural people of God is enslaved by its being under the law, something which is not true of the spiritual, genuine Israel. Respecting the warrant for a typological apprehension of the Old Testament generally, WIESELER justly remarks: "Since the whole of the Old Covenant is a σκιά of the New Testament dispensation, the single facts, persons and truths have therefore a prefigurative character, according to the measure in which each has within this whole and in relation to the New Covenant, a conspicuous and central significance." That this applies to the person of Abraham is clear, and equally to the manner in which children were born to him, for through Abraham's children the progress of the history of redemption is determined. But if even with an Isaac it is primarily only the manner of his birth to which this signification attached, yet the *condition* in which he was born, was an inseparable element of that; for from the legitimate, and therefore free, wife of Abraham, came naturally also the legitimate son, the son of promise; the freedom of Isaac was therefore not an accidental but an essential quality of him who was born in virtue of a Divine promise, and so Paul has a right to attribute to the fact of his freedom also, a typical importance, and to attribute the same to the opposite condition of Ishmael. If this prefigurative character of Abraham and his sons is acknowledged, it is clear, that the Apostle's allegory is not arbitrary or accidental, but that it has a point of attachment in the actual history. But—and this is commonly overlooked—the allegory is not on this account eliminated from the passage; the allegory has its ground in the typical relation of Abraham's two children to the two congregations of God, but yet for all this it is in form allegory. For αὗται γάρ εἰσι δύο διαθῆκαι is allegory, not typology; the two women were certainly not *prophetic types* of the two covenants. Something like this might be said, that the two women are, as mothers of the two diverse children of Abraham, types of the two churches of God, the external and the spiritual, conceived as collective personalities, as mothers of their members, although even this would be strained; but to say outright that the two mothers are *prophetic types* of two covenants, yields no rational sense. Only by allegorizing can Paul see in the two mothers two covenants, but the allegory is taken from the facts themselves, inasmuch as it is the covenants by which the character of the antitypes of the sons of those mothers is determined. It is necessary to acknowledge this mingling of Type and Allegory, or the passage will not be rightly apprehended. We feel that it is not merely allegory, and look for the type, and again we feel that it is not purely type; the two, in truth, are interwoven with each other.

If we could venture to draw from our section a general conclusion, it would be this: (1) that allegorizing portions of Scripture is not forbidden, provided only that it is acknowledged as such, and not given forth as exegesis proper; (2) that it is warranted in proportion as it has a typological basis which itself is authorized. What this is may be judged by the remarks above.—While we should acknowledge, therefore, that our allegory has an objective foundation, that Paul does not interpolate something into the narrative of Genesis at his own fancy, it is not on the other hand (to come to the second inquiry, as to the use he makes of it), correct to say that "he ascribes to it an objective value as proof." For that he is too sober-minded, for he undoubtedly is, as was remarked, far removed from that allegorizing exegesis which *bona fide* declares: This and this is *meant* in the passage besides the letter [? See below.—R.], and which therefore upon this assumption proves the "higher truth" by means of allegorical explanation from a Scripture passage. If we look more closely, we find moreover, that he does not at all *argue* his proposition of the freedom of Christians *from* the narrative of Genesis; he does not infer any thing like this: Sarah signifies the upper Jerusalem, Isaac the Christians, therefore Christians are the children of the upper Jerusalem; moreover Sarah is free, therefore the upper Jerusalem is free, and Christians are children of the free congregation, and therefore likewise free. On the other hand he asserts the freedom of the Jerusalem above as self-evident, and resulting from the previously assumed ground of the covenant of grace, on which it rests, as opposed to the covenant of works, and then first expressly demonstrates from a prophetical passage that Christians are children of the Jerusalem above, and so comes to the conclusion that they are free (see the exegesis above). If it is inquired: Why then

is the narrative of Genesis adduced, a narrative of type interwoven with allegory? the answer is simple: in order, by reference to the simple relations of things in the beginning of the theocratic people, to illustrate the higher relations of the present, or better: in order to furnish a confirmation of the latter by pointing out the relation between type and antitype = see, at the very beginning it was the same! For that typology may serve, with or without the application of allegory, which of course makes no difference, but not for strict proof; and still less bare allegory, when and where it is acknowledged as such.—We cannot draw a different conclusion from the remark, ver. 21: Do ye not hear the law? The sense is simply: Do ye not then see that matters stood just the same with the ancient typical personages? The spiritually begotten Son was born in the condition of freedom and that should dispose you to give credit to my previous argument! Here the expression sounds, it is true, as if every reader of the law would be constrained to deduce this from the narrative in Genesis, as if this therefore simply signified the higher truth which is now under discussion, and merely expressed it under the veil of history; still whoever gives even cursory attention will not be tempted to press these words, but will recognize in them a rhetorical drapery.

4. [*Paul's treatment of the Old Testament narrative.* A reference to the exegesis of ver. 24 will justify the following conclusions: 1) Paul does not regard the Old Testament narrative as in itself an allegory. He is careful to use a subject (*ἅτινα*) which is general enough to prevent our making such an unwarranted assumption. 2) His interpretation is not "subjective, fanciful or rabbinical."* The predicate *ἀλληγορούμενα* means "to have an allegorical meaning." Hence the meaning inheres in the nature of the "things," and does not depend on his acute speculation respecting them. On exegetical grounds, Schmoller is not warranted in affirming that Paul does not imply: "This and this is *meant* in the passage besides the letter." In his proper anxiety to guard against "allegorizing exegesis" he gives some room for assumptions respecting the "subjective" character of this allegory of the Apostle. Against such attempts to represent the interpretation of St. Paul as subjective, *i. e.*, to speak plainly *erroneous*, Ellicott properly remarks: "It would be well for such writers to remember that St. Paul is here declaring, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, that the passage he has cited has a second and a deeper meaning than it appears to have; that it has that meaning, then, is a positive, objective and indisputable truth."—3) This passage gives no countenance to "allegorizing exegesis" of the Scriptures. This error, once so common, may have a different origin from attempts to make the Bible narrative a mere allegory, but it tends in the same direction, destroys the true knowledge and perverts the true use of the Scriptures. He may properly allegorize, who has the inspiration Paul had, but only when that inspiration shows him that "these things *have* an allegorical meaning." On this point Calvin says: "As the Apostle declares that these things are allegorized, Origen and many others along with him, have seized the occasion of torturing Scripture, in every possible manner, away from the true sense. They concluded that the literal sense is too mean and poor, and that, under the outward bark of the letter, there lurk deeper mysteries, which cannot be extracted but by beating out allegories. And this they had no difficulty in accomplishing: for speculations which appear to be ingenious have always been preferred, and always will be preferred by the world to sound doctrine. For many centuries no man was considered to be ingenious, who had not the skill and daring necessary for changing into a variety of curious shapes the sacred word of God. This was undoubtedly a contrivance of Satan to undermine the authority of Scripture, and to take away from the reading of it the true advantage. God visited this profanation by a just judgment, when He suffered the pure meaning of the Scripture to be buried under false interpretations. I acknowledge that Scripture is a most rich and inexhaustible fountain of all wisdom; but I deny that its fertility consists in the various meanings which any man, at his pleasure, may assign. Let us know, then, that the true meaning of Scripture is the natural and obvious meaning; and let us embrace and abide by it resolutely."*—R.]

*[Every proper theory of inspiration must admit that Paul's early education had its influence on his character as teacher. But the word "rabbinical" contains a moral or rather immoral implication, which cannot be allowed.—R.]

*[Lightfoot gives Philo's allegory of this same passage, and compares it with Paul's: "Philo's allegory is as follows. Abraham—the human soul progressing towards the knowledge of God—unites himself first with Sarah and then with Hagar. These two alliances stand in direct opposition the one to the other. Sarah, the princess—for such is the interpretation of the word—is divine wisdom. To her therefore Abraham is bidden to listen in all that she says. On the other hand Hagar, whose name signifies 'sojourning,' and points therefore to something transient and unsatisfying, is a preparatory or intermediate training—the instruction of the schools—secular learning, as it might be termed in modern phrase. Hence she is fitly described as an Egyptian, as Sarah's handmaid. Abraham's alliance with Sarah is at first premature. He is not sufficiently advanced in his moral and spiritual development to profit thereby. As yet he begets no son by her. She therefore directs him to go in to her handmaid, to apply himself to the learning of the schools. This inferior alliance proves fruitful at once. At a later date and after this preliminary training he again unites himself to Sarah; and this time his union with divine wisdom is fertile. Not only does Sarah bear him a son, but she is pointed out as the mother of a countless offspring. Thus is realized the strange paradox that the barren woman is most fruitful. Thus in the progress of the human soul are verified the words of the prophet, spoken in an allegory, that 'the desolate hath many children.'

But the allegory does not end here. The contrast between the mothers is reproduced in the contrast between the sons. Isaac represents the wisdom of the wise man; Ishmael the sophistry of the sophist. Sophistry must in the end give place to wisdom. The son of the bondwoman must be cast out and flee before the son of the princess.

Such is the ingenious application of Philo—most like and yet most unlike that of St. Paul. They both allegorize, and in so doing they touch upon the same points in the narrative, they use the same text by way of illustration. Yet in their whole tone and method they stand in direct contrast, and their results have nothing in common. Philo is, as usual, wholly unhistorical. With St. Paul, on the other hand, Hagar's career is an allegory, because it is a history. The symbol and the thing symbolized are the same in kind. This simple passage of patriarchal life represents in miniature the workings of God's Providence hereafter to be exhibited in grander proportions in the history of the Christian church. The Christian Apostle and the philosophic Jew move in parallel lines, or as it were, keeping side by side, and yet never once crossing each other's path.

And there is still another point in which the contrast between the two is great. With Philo the allegory is the

5. *The two covenants and their children.* The fact that the Apostle recognizes a significance in the Scripture narrative of the twofold character of the wives and sons of Abraham, is a sign of his clear-minded way of viewing the Scripture; by the less reminded of the greater, in the germ already seeing the fruit. It is at the same time a sign of his pedagogic wisdom, that to those who boasted themselves of their descent from Abraham, he so simply discovers the insufficiency, and particularly the perversity of this boast, by referring to the twofold relation of sonship to Abraham, of which the one is so entirely destitute of ground for boasting. On the other hand, he shows here also again, as in chap. iii., his deep and clear view into the economy of salvation, and its guiding principles, in the first place by definitely distinguishing the two covenants in the history of redemption, and then by the way in which he characterizes them. There is a covenant of law and a covenant of grace; and both are mothers, that bear children, only in different wise and with different consequences. The first covenant bears children in the way of natural generation, for it finds its concrete manifestation in the carnal Israel and its members. All the natural children of Israel have part in this covenant; but it is simply a covenant which brings to the participants in it bondage and only that, for it imposes on them the law. It is widely different with the covenant of grace. This also has children, yea a great number of them, but these children God Himself brings to it through the operation of the Spirit (it does not obtain them, as it were, of itself), for this covenant finds its concrete manifestation in the spiritual Israel, which obtains its children in a spiritual way, and not by outward descent. This is the first covenant which brings to its members freedom, and does not transfer them into bondage under a law; for it does not make the attainment of God's blessing dependent on the keeping of legal commandments and prohibitions, but secures it to its members as a pure bestowment of Divine grace. Intimately related therefore as Paul knows these two covenants and communities to stand to each other (for they are still like children of the one father), yet again he keeps them sharply and clearly apart.—Especially noticeable is the conception of the upper Jerusalem, the signification of which has been explained above. In the first place, therefore, Paul distinguishes the spiritual from the carnal Israel, the ideal from the empirical. With the external Israel the idea of the theocratic people was as yet by no means realized as to its true substance; on the contrary this was a conception of much higher range. Therefore all vaunting by the Jews of their nationality, as alone entitled to be reckoned God's people, is ungrounded. Above the theocratic people in its national manifestation within the Jewish community stood yet again the true people of God, that even in this community already found individual members, for under the Old Testament all were not children of Ishmael's, and under the New Testament all are not children of Israel's sort. And indeed from Abraham down, the true people of God was never quite extinct, but yet, so long as the covenant of law, and therewith the carnal Israel were in the ascendant, it could not yet come to developed existence. This it attained only through Christ. It is noticeable, secondly, that Paul in this conception of the Jerusalem above, has a conception, which stands still higher than that of the Christian body; the Jerusalem above is the mother. Christians are only the children. Unquestionably, however, they are actually the children, and so far even in this expression their rank is declared=they are children of no lesser one, and should therefore not forget what they owe to themselves and their rank, should not unworthily lower themselves. But on the other hand, they are only children, and are what they are, only through their mother. The Christian community is not of itself in its empirical manifestation already=the spiritual Israel, but has continually in this its *spiritualis nutrix.* We see how that which Paul expresses with his "Jerusalem above" is what dogmatic theology has endeavored to embody in its conception of an *ecclesia invisibilis*, by which it strives to guard the church against a false emphasizing of her empirical manifestation, and as it were to preserve to her her ideality. Only that the conception of the *ecclesia invisibilis* is in the first place a narrower one, limited more to the church since Christ, and still more, it is a secondary and negative one, first formed by abstraction from the mixed condition of the church on earth, while the idea of the Jerusalem above is a positive, primary one, grounded in the biblical economy of salvation itself.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 19. LUTHER:—The Apostles, all devout preachers and also schoolmasters, are (in their peculiar way) also our parents. For like as we from our natural birth have from our parents the form of our bodies, so do these men help thereto, that our heart and conscience attain within us to a perfect form. Now the perfect form which a Christian heart should have, is faith, whereby we lay hold on Christ, cleave to Him alone and to no other thing besides.—BERLENB. BIBLE:—In nothing do more pangs of travail come to pass, than in the ministration of the gospel. The ministration of the law is a mere nothing compared with it. Evangelical preaching excludes all works accomplished in a merely outward way to which men nevertheless cleave.—"Until" points to a troublesome delay, that falls between the beginning and the accomplishment of a matter; not as if God would not at once proceed to the formation of us, but because on the side of man a bolt is interposed, and yet God does not give over.—LANGE:—Even, as in many men, especially in their outward habit, gestures, words and actions, we find such a fashion of the world, that as it were we see in them even personally the vanity, wantonness and folly of the world, and

---

whole substance of his teaching; with Paul it is but an accessory. He uses it rather as an illustration than an argument, as a means of representing in a lively form the lessons before enforced on other grounds. It is, to use Luther's comparison, the painting which decorates the house already built."

The very pleasing character of Philo's allegory is a warning against such interpretations. They always aim to be as captivating as his, and often succeed, only to be most unlike Paul's "in tone and method."—R.]

are inwardly troubled at it; so on the other hand, in believers who come to their proper vigor, the new birth from God appears in all about them, saving their yet remaining weaknesses, in such a manner, that we see in them a true form of Christ in their weakness, humility, simplicity and uprightness, and are moved to inward joy thereby.

Ver. 20. LUTHER:—The living voice is to be counted as an empress. For this can amplify or condense the matter, and suit itself to all occasions of time, place, persons and the requirement of any necessity.

Ver. 21. RIEGER:—The will has very great influence in the belief and unbelief of men. Even in falling back under the law, the will of the flesh seeks its advantage. The law is indeed the world's crafty covering, under which it slinks away from the truth of Christ; which covering must be withdrawn from it.—FRANTZ:—In the law there is contained more than the commandments; more than the ways and usages, ceremonies and ordinances enjoined in the worship of the Jews. There is also more contained therein, than many after the letter read therein. There is contained therein also a revelation of the ways of God, which God hath chosen, to carry out His everlasting purpose among men. There is contained therein a history, which has come to pass from its beginning to its accomplishment on earth, that therein, as in a mirror, should be made known the thoughts of peace and salvation, which God has towards men and which in due time He will carry into execution.

Ver. 23.—Nature assists us not to salvation, but grace alone. We are all according to our natural birth born flesh of flesh; but according to His promise hath God regenerated us through the bath of holy baptism.

Ver 24. RIEGER: — This example serves to guard us against dealing too slightingly with the history of the Old Testament.—BERLENB. BIBLE: —All that Moses has described are figures of the inner spiritual and genuine life in Christ.—SPENER:—"Bringeth forth unto bondage." Those that will be saved by the law and its works and therefore reject the gospel, are not God's children, nor heirs of eternal life, but at their highest are only servants and therefore under sin and the curse.

Ver. 26. LUTHER:—The holy church bears and genders children continually, even to the last day, in that she exercises the ministry, that is, teaches and diffuses the gospel which is her manner of bearing. Now the gospel teaches that we are redeemed and become free from the curse of the law, from sin, death and all manner of ill, not through the law and works, but through Christ. Therefore is the holy church not subjected to the law or works, but free is she, a mother without law, without sin and death. But what she is as a mother, so are also her children.—"Free."—Even the ten commandments have no right to accuse, nor to terrify the conscience, wherein Christ rules by His grace and moreover outwardly: the civil laws of Moses concern us no longer. Yet the gospel does not therewith make us free from all other civil laws, for so long as we are in this natural life, the gospel subjects us to the civil laws which the government of each land has. But since our mortal life must forsooth have some ceremonies, we can by no means dispense with them. Therefore the gospel admits that we may make in the Christian Church some special ordinances concerning holy days, times, places, *etc.*—but not in the thought that those who observe such order, should thereby merit forgiveness of sins.

Ver. 27. Although the little flock, *i. e.*, the dear Christian Church, that receives the doctrine of the gospel, and earnestly cleaves thereto, appears altogether unfruitful, forsaken, weak and despicable, and moreover outwardly suffers persecution, and is constrained to hear herself accused of teaching heretical and seditious things, she is nevertheless alone fruitful before God, and brings forth through the ministry innumerably many children, who are heirs of eternal life.

Ver. 28. In STARKE:—Natural birth has with God no preëminence; He chooses Abel before Cain, Jacob before Esau, Ephraim before Manasses, *etc.*; whoever feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted of Him, and whoever cleaves in true faith to the promise, is a child of one promise, and shall attain to the promised everlasting inheritance.—If we are like Isaac in his birth, let us also become like him in his virtues.

Ver. 29. LANGE:—Whatever church oppresses and persecutes another in matters of faith, such an one is not the true apostolic church; therefore also she neither stands in the true filial relation to God, nor has part in the inheritance of eternal life.—LUTHER:—It is ever thus, that Ishmael persecutes Isaac, but on the contrary the good Isaac leaves Ishmael in peace. Whoever will be unpersecuted by Ishmael, let him profess that he is no Christian.—SPENER:—The church's condition is in some particulars ever the same; it may always be said: As it was at that time so is it now.

Ver. 30.—SPENER: — Persecutions harm in fact not the persecuted but the persecutors. To the persecuted there remains yet God's grace, love and heaven, but the persecutors load themselves with God's wrath. — BERLENB. BIBLE:— The whole natural man must, as a scoffer and wild man such as Ishmael was, be set aside from all righteousness of birth, and devices of his own through a renewed obedient will. And although that involves a dying and giving up, inasmuch as the false nature sinks into the death of its own desires and so becomes powerless, yet the new awakened sense makes no account of that, because it has a hatred against the old man, and renounces therefore courageously all impulses of nature, let them have as holy a seeming as they may. Thereby the scoffer becomes in his turn a scoffing before the new man.

Vers. 21–30. Two sorts of children of Abraham: to which dost thou belong? To the children of the bondwoman or of the freewoman? Law or grace? Either—or? 1. The two stand indeed in relation to each other (one Father), but yet are 2. essentially distinct (two widely different mothers). *a.* Law-Flesh (= the lawman still the carnal man), Grace — Spirit (=the carnal man has no part in it); *b.* Law-Bondage, Grace-Freedom.—Christians are children, not of the bondwoman, but of the freewoman. 1. Rejoice! 2. Consider well!—The

Jerusalem above 1. a mother, 2. a mother through promise, 3. a free mother.—The covenant of law a fruitful mother. (Many depend on it, because the natural man remains thereby natural), but yet the covenant of grace has the promise of God.—Christians are children of the Jerusalem above. 1. How? Because children of the promise. 2. What do they obtain thereby? They participate in her condition of freedom.—The Jerusalem above free: 1) not bound to the law = not held to obtaining salvation by works of the law; 2) not obnoxious to its curse. The children of the promise, *i. e.*, 1. They are members of God's people not by nature but only through promise; 2. they attain heavenly inheritance, only in consequence of promise, not by their own works.—Christians have their type in Isaac; 1. Born as he through promise (see above); 2. Persecuted like him, by Ishmael, 3. but for all that children of the freewoman and therefore alone heirs.—Who obtains the inheritance? 1) not the natural man, but the spiritual; 2) not the son of the bond woman but of the freewoman.—Human self-will (Hagar, Ishmael), divine counsel; 1) The latter permits the former, 2) but still gains the victory.

E. Admonition to perseverance in Christian freedom—with a threatening allusion to the pernicious consequences of the opposite course.

CHAPTER IV. 31—V. 6.

31 So then [Wherefore],[1] brethren, we are not children of the [a] bondwoman, but
IV. 1 of the free. Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us
free [Stand fast therefore in the liberty for which Christ made us free, or For freedom Christ made us free. Stand fast therefore],[2] and be not entangled again with
2 [in] the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul[3] say unto you, that if ye be circumcised
3 [i. e., *submit to circumcision*],[4] Christ shall [will] profit you nothing. For [Moreover, δέ continuative] I testify again to every man that is circumcised [who has him-
4 self circumcised], that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no
effect unto you [Ye are separated from Christ],[5] whosoever of you are justified [being
5 justified] by [in] the law; ye are fallen [fallen away] from grace. For we through
6 [by] the Spirit wait[6] for the hope of righteousness by [from] faith. For in Jesus
Christ [Christ Jesus] neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision;
but faith which worketh by [working through] love.

F. Renewed lamentation over the apostasy of the Galatians. Sharp testimony against the misleading misrepresentations of his preaching on the part of the false teachers.

CHAPTER V. 7–12.

7 Ye did run [were running] well; who did hinder[7] you that ye should not obey
8, 9 the truth?[8] This [The] persuasion *cometh* not of him that calleth you. A lit-
10 tle leaven leaveneth[9] the whole lump. I [I, for my part] have confidence in [as
regards] you through [in] the Lord, that ye will be none [in nothing] otherwise
11 minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be. And
[But] I, brethren, if I yet [still] preach circumcision, why do I yet [still] suffer
persecution? then is the offence of the cross ceased [the scandal of the cross done
12 away with]. I would they were even cut off which trouble you [I would that they
who are unsettling you would even mutilate themselves, or would even cut themselves off from you].[10]

[1] Ver. 31.—א. διό. [So B. D[1]. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott, Alford, Lightfoot. Ἄρα (Rec.) is feebly supported; as also ἡμεῖς δέ.—R.]

[2] Ver. 1.—The correct reading is probably that of Lachmann: τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν· στήκετε οὖν. So א, which also begins chap. v. with στήκετε. [This reading is supported also by A. B. C. D., and adopted by Usteri, Meyer (4th ed., Schmoller mentions the other reading as his) and Alford. Τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ᾗ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν, στήκετε οὖν is supported by D.[2 3] E. K. L., the great majority of cursives, many versions and fathers, and is adopted by Griesbach, Rückert, Tischendorf, Wieseler, Ellicott, Wordsworth, Lightfoot (who differs in punctuation however). Between these two readings the choice is very difficult. The authorities are so equally divided, and as the verbal difference is slight, the critical question resolves itself into this delicate one: whether the transcriber was more likely to have omitted or inserted ᾗ, because of ἡμᾶς immediately following. Meyer thinks it was inserted, others that it was omitted. The latter opinion

seems more probable, and the second reading is preferable on diplomatic grounds. The renderings given above are in accordance with the two readings, but minor variations in interpretation are noticed in the EXEG. NOTES.

We find besides, οὖν placed after ἐλευθερίᾳ, but this is feebly supported; it is put after στήκετε in ℵ. A. B. C. F. On this position of the particle, an argument for Lachmann s punctuation is based, though it is not decisive. Χριστός is placed before ἡμᾶς in C. K. L.; after it in ℵ. A. B. D. E. F. G.

Lightfoot not only begins a new sentence at στήκετε, but, retaining ᾗ. is forced to join the first clause directly with ver. 31, and to render: we are sons "of her wh › is free with that freedom which Christ has given us." So Schott and Rinck. This seems forced, but Lightfoot's note on the various readings is valuable.—On the other variations from the E. V., in this verse, see EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[3] Ver. 2.—ℵ. omits Παῦλος, inserted however by the corrector.

[4] Ver. 2.—[Both here and in ver. 3, the reference is not to the fact of having been circumcised, but now resorting to the rite as necessary.—R.]

[5] Ver. 4.—[Schmoller renders: *abgetrennt seid ihr von (der gemeinschaft mit) Christo.* The construction is pregnant, and scarcely admits of a literal translation. Vulgate: *evacuati estis a.* Alford's "annihilates from Christ" is objectionable. Ellicott's paraphrase is good: "Your union with Christ became void" (so Meyer). It seems both more lively and more exact to retain the present in English, since "the aorists (κατηργήθητε, ἐξεπέσατε) represent the consequences as instantaneous" (Lightfoot).—R.]

[6] Ver. 5.—ℵ. has ἐκδεχόμεθα, ℵ.[3] ἀπεκδεχόμεθα.

[7] Ver. 7.—[Rec. has ἀνέκοψε, but the correct reading is ἐνέκοψε (all MSS., most cursives, and modern editors).—R.]

[8] Ver. 7.—Τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι is, without ground, deemed spurious by Semler and Kopp. [ℵ. A. B. Lachmann, Lightfoot, omit τῇ; retained on good authority by Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott.—R.]

[9] Ver. 9.—Δολοῖ is a gloss.

[10] Ver. 12.—[See EXEG. NOTES, on the meaning of this verse.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 31. **Wherefore, brethren, we are not children of a bondwoman.**—Paul, after the indirect warning in vers. 29, 30, sums up the contents of vers. 22 sq. once more, in an exact form, appealing to the Christian sense of dignity =you will therefore surely not suffer yourselves to be reduced to children of the bondwoman. [Notice the omission of the article: "not of any bondwoman," Judaism or any form of heathenism (LIGHTFOOT, MEYER, ELLICOTT). This explanation is more striking and appropriate than that of ALFORD, who is disposed to think παιδίσκης is anarthrous, because emphatically prefixed to its governing noun.—R.]—**But of the free,**—therefore ourselves free. This Paul expressly states in the following sentence.

Ver. 1, refers the freedom of *Christians* to Christ; yet the main idea is no longer the fact or method of their having become free, but the end, namely: τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ, for freedom, for being and remaining free. Then follows the admonition itself; στήκετε, used absolutely, without any modifying clause=remain firm. [Schmoller follows Lachmann, in beginning a new sentence with στήκετε; of course if a different punctuation is adopted, the verb is modified by the preceding clause, without altering its meaning however. He also takes τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ as dative *commodi*, "for freedom," not instrumental, "with freedom" (so ALFORD). It must be remarked that this pointing makes the style very abrupt, and that since the stress in this interpretation rests on *for* freedom, the end of their being made free, so emphatic a thought would scarcely be expressed by a dative of doubtful force, for as LIGHTFOOT observes, the dative is awkward, in whatever way it is taken. Even MEYER explains the passage far more satisfactorily, on the theory that the other reading is correct. Following this reading, we render: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty for" or "with which Christ made us free." The prominent dative then denotes "the sphere in which and to which the action is limited" (ELLICOTT); and the relative ᾗ is either dative *commodi* (WINER, ELLICOTT) or ablative (instrumental, LUTHER, BEZA, CALVIN). MEYER thinks this latter usage is uncommon with Paul. The former is safer. The sense is then: therefore stand fast in that liberty (which is our state as children of the freewoman, and) for which, to remain in which, Christ made us free.—R.]

Be not entangled again.—As Gentiles they had not formerly been under the yoke of the Mosaic law, but for all that had certainly (see iv. 8) been in bondage; having now become free from it by their faith in Christ, they ought not to allow themselves to be enslaved again by a yoke. [**In the yoke of bondage.**—"In" it, because the thought is of being ensnared; they were to stand upright, not to bow to the yoke (LIGHTFOOT); "bondage" was its predominant nature (ELLICOTT).—R.] All that preceded, doctrinal exposition and expostulation, pointed to *this* exhortation: to remain free. But just because this lies at the foundation of everything preceding, the brief, plain utterance in this verse suffices, and the Apostle at once turns to a warning menace in case the admonition should not be heeded, and the Galatians instead should go so far as to submit to circumcision.

Ver. 2. **Behold I Paul say unto you that if ye be circumcised.**—Rousing personal attention with "Behold" and with the interposition of his personal authority,* "I Paul," he warns them against the final step, not yet taken by them, which would bring them completely under the yoke of the law, namely, the receiving of circumcision. [It is highly probable that some of them had been circumcised, and that the present points to the continuance of this course of conduct among them (ALFORD, ELLICOTT). He does not mean that the fact of a man's being a circumcised man would prevent his being a Christian, but if after all this instruction and warning, they resorted to this rite as necessary to salvation, "Christ will," etc.—R.] They would then have had no advantage of Christ, because they would have sought salvation in circumcision and not of Christ.—**Will profit you nothing.**—The future is probably (as in ver. 5) to be referred to the παρουσία and the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. [So MEYER, who finds in this a reference to its nearness. But he is fond of such references. ELLICOTT with more propriety says: "it simply marks the certain *result* of such a course of practice;

* [WORDSWORTH finds here a reference to the false accusation (ver. 11) that he preached circumcision, and LIGHTFOOT thinks this is probably an indirect refutation of calumnies as well as an assertion of authority.—R.]

'Christ (as you will find) will never profit you anything.'"—R.]

Ver. 3. **Moreover I testify again.**—Paul strengthens his warning by referring to a further consequence of receiving circumcision. It obliges to the observance of the *whole* law; "for circumcision makes one a full participant in the covenant of law, a proselyte of righteousness, and the law demands of the one that is held to it its complete fulfilment (iii. 10)." MEYER. At the same time Paul gives with this a more precise explanation of "Christ will profit you nothing" so much the more certainly will this be the case, because a man by receiving circumcision becomes **a debtor to do the whole law**, and therefore is not at liberty to persuade himself, that he does not mean to erect again the law as a whole, but only to accept one point. But all, who are "of the works of the law are under the curse," iii. 10.—In view of the solemnity of the asseveration we must suppose that the false teachers designedly concealed this perilous consequence of circumcision or sought to soften it. "Again" alludes to the earlier (second) presence of the Apostle.

Ver. 4. **Ye are separated from Christ.**—"Paul by speaking asyndetically and recurring to the second person speaks so much the more emphatically and vividly."—MEYER.—The verse expresses the consequence of becoming "a debtor to do the whole law" (for ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθαι is substantially identically with this). This is the καταργ. ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ which completes the explanation of the declaration in ver. 2.—Καταργεῖσθαι ἀπό τινος, a pregnant expression = the connection in which one stands with any one is done away, and so one is loose from him.—Justification by the law and justification for Christ's sake are mutually exclusive: whoever seeks the first falls out of fellowship with Christ. **Justified**, here of course an expression representing the view of the persons concerned, who think "through the law we shall be justified."—**Ye are fallen away from grace.**—Here he expressly names the benefit the loss of which they suffer by "being justified in the law" and the resulting separation from Christ. A cutting contrast: they think that they are being justified, but by this very means instead they are fallen away from grace, so far is an actual justification from being possible in this way.* 'Ἐκπίπτειν τῆς χάριτος opposed to ἑστηκέναι ἐν τῇ χάριτι (Rom. v. 2).

Ver. 5. **For we by the spirit wait for the hope of righteousness from faith.**—"A justification of the judgment passed in ver. 4 upon those that seek to be justified through the law, drawn *e contrario, i. e.*, from the entirely different manner in which Paul and those like him wish to be justified." MEYER. ["We" *i. e.* those who have not sought justification in the law, and fallen from grace; the contrast is not very strongly marked in the subject however (δέ is not used), for Paul addresses the Galatians, not as those who had fallen, but were in danger of falling, and the subject "we" may include them also.—R.] Πνεύματι is used neither of the human spirit in itself, nor of the spirit of man enlightened by the Holy Ghost, but of the Spirit of God as the objective principle of the Christian life. As it is from the Holy Spirit working in believers, that the whole Christian life proceeds, so in particular the persevering Christian hope is thus wrought, of the fulfilment of which he also gives pledge (2 Cor. i. 22; v. 5, Eph. i. 14; Rom. iii. 11–23). So WIESELER and MEYER. But of course this hope of future righteousness proceeds from the Holy Ghost only so far as it rests upon a right basis. This basis is then stated in ἐκ πίστεως, which is meant to express that Christians ground their hope of future righteousness not upon the works of the law, but precisely on faith alone, that they hope to be justified not in the law but by faith. ['Ἐκ πίστεως does not therefore describe πνεύματι (LUTHER), but the latter sets forth the agent: "by the spirit," the former the origin or source (Schmoller says with less exactness, the ground) of their hope. "By faith" cannot qualify "righteousness," as the order of the E. V. seems to indicate.—R.] Δικαιοσύνη is here also of course, Righteousness before God = δικαίωσις. But this is here represented for Christians as something future; we are therefore not to understand it of that which takes place in time, but of the δικαίωσις which comes to completion only at the final judgment. But it is a difficulty that it does not simply read: ἐλπίδα δικ. ἔχομεν, but ἐλπ. ἀπεκδ. whereby the hope itself is presented in turn as an object of hope. 'Ἐλπίς is therefore here to be understood as the object of hope, *res sperata*, as in Col i. 5; Tit. ii. 13, and δικαιοσύνης as genitive of apposition. 'Ἀπεκδέχεσθαι is more precisely not = ἐλπίζειν itself, but = to wait for, to expect perseveringly (WIESELER). [This view of the passage, which is that of WIESELER, avoids the seeming pleonasm, "wait for the hope," but is open to one serious objection, viz.: that the genitive is never thus used with ἐλπίς (MEYER). Besides ἐλπίδα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα is not pleonastic, but forcible and almost poetical, the accusative being cognate (ELLICOTT). The genitive may be regarded as 1) *subjecti;* the hoped for reward of righteousness, *sc.* eternal life (so Beza, Bengel and most older commentators). This avoids the seeming difficulty of every other interpretation, viz.: making "righteousness" future, but it is not in keeping with the context, as it introduces and gives prominence to an adjunct of "righteousness," while the passage treats of "justification." 2) It seems best then to take it as genitive *objecti, i. e.* the hope of being justified (so MEYER, ELLICOTT, ALFORD, also the versions of Tyndale and Cranmer). This is strictly grammatical and in keeping with the context. The objection that it makes "righteousness" future is easily met, see below.—R.] That Paul should here speak of the (complete and final) justification, as some thing to be expected first in the future, is entirely accordant with the context. In ver. 4 he speaks of such as, being already justified by faith, now turn to the law and thereby suffer the loss of grace. In order to illustrate the latter, he now enforces the truth, that a Christian must remain in faith, because only then can he have

*[LIGHTFOOT renders "are driven forth, are banished with Hagar your mother," but while this meaning of ἐκπίπτειν is classical, it is not found elsewhere in New Testament and must not be pressed.—R.]

the hope of justification at the judgment; faith remains the condition of the state of grace, for even at the final judgment it is the condition of gracious acceptance. [This view contrasts Christianity with Judaism, and represents "justification as one of those divine results, which stretches into eternity, conveying with it and involving the idea of future blessedness and glorification" (ELLICOTT).—R.]

Ver. 6. He now proceeds to justify the waiting "for the hope from faith" on the part of the *Christian*. **For in Christ Jesus** = for him that is in Christ Jesus, for the Christian, **neither circumcision availeth anything** = has no influence in the attainment of justification (in the sense of ver. 5), **nor uncircumcision** (while the Galatian false teachers laid so great stress upon this distinction); **but faith working through love**, faith which shows itself operative through love.—Ἐνεργεῖσθαι is always middle in the New Testament. The passive meaning given by many of the older Catholics, as BELLARMINE and ESTIUS, in the interest of the Catholic system, is therefore incorrect. Reference is made to this display of the activity of faith through love, in view of the following section ver. 13 sq., the theme of which is given in our verse. [LIGHTFOOT: "These words bridge over the gulf which seems to separate the language of St. Paul and St. James. Both assert a principle of practical energy, as opposed to a barren, inactive theory." Against the use made of this passage by modern Romanist commentators who give up the passive sense, such as WINDISCHMANN, MÖHLER, *Symbolik*, see ALFORD and DOCTRINAL NOTES below.—R.]

Ver. 7. **Ye were running well.**—Short, emotional, and therefore asyndetic propositions respecting the unhappy alterations which had taken place with the Galatians.—The comparison of the Christian walk to a race is, as is well known, a favorite one with Paul. The running well consisted in obedience to the truth, that is, in their going in the true=evangelical, way, seeking their righteousness in faith.—Paul asks in surprise: **Who did hinder you?***

Ver. 8. He here answers the last assertion to himself and them. Certainly, it is not God that has turned you away, has brought you upon this other way! The intriguing of the false teachers is represented as something ungodly. Ἡ πεισμ. κ. τ. λ., therefore, is to be translated; The persuading is not from your caller=God. The calling and the persuading are opposed to each other as distinct in character; the former is divine activity, the latter not, but essentially human with human intention, art, importunity (MEYER).—In itself "persuasion" could have also a passive signification=the being persuaded, disposition to follow; and so many interpreters take it here also=obsequiousness towards the false teachers. [In favor of the latter meaning we have the support of the Greek expositors, and perhaps the paranomasia (πείθεσθαι, ver 7). But MEYER, ALFORD, ELLICOTT prefer the active meaning, both because it is better established, and because it suits the active meaning of "calleth." It seems to accord better with ver. 9 also.—R.]

Ver. 9. **A little leaven.**—It is disputed whether this refers to doctrine or persons; a little leaven of doctrine, as a few bad men, false teachers. Manifestly the former. It is not the number of the false teachers that is of account, but the influence of their teaching, not the πείθοντες but the πεισμονή. Plainly nothing else is meant by "leaven" than the immediately preceding "persuasion," for of this, "leaven" is an image. As the leaven works into the **lump**, so does the "persuasion," the persuasive, seducing word into the soul (or into a whole community): therefore=even an influence in itself apparently insignificant, may nevertheless be ruinous to the whole man (or whole community of men). [The proverb (quoted also 1 Cor. v. 6) is undoubtedly true both of doctrines and persons. To which it refers here is extremely doubtful. In support of each view the best commentators may be cited, and the context is not decisive, for while ver. 8 may favor the former reference, ver. 10 with its individualizing turn, favors the latter. Leaven is, as usually, a symbol of evil.—R.] This of course contains a warning to be on their guard, and to turn back in time, and remove the leaven.—The Apostle, in order the easier to win them to him, expresses the confidence which he still continues to have in them.

Ver. 10. **I, for my part,**—even though the false teachers believe you already won over to them.—He knows his confidence to be grounded **in the Lord.** The Lord will doubtless bring it to pass and give you the right mind—in the interest of His cause.—Οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονήσετε is best taken absolutely=that you will not be otherwise minded than hitherto, that you will not alter your conviction, will not apostatize. It is true, a giving way had indeed already begun; but it was as yet only in its incipiency; evidently Paul deals with them throughout as those that are yet wavering, and therefore it may well be hoped of them that matters will not come to an actual ἄλλο φρονεῖν=change of conviction. Up to the present time they are only, as is immediately expressed, "troubled."—**He that troubleth you**=every one, who, &c. The supposition that the Apostle refers to a leader among his opponents well known to himself (ERASMUS, LUTHER, BENGEL and others), or even to Peter (JEROME), is supported by nothing in the Epistle. Therefore also **whosoever he be** ought to be understood as entirely general, and not referred to any eminent consideration enjoyed by the false teachers. Undoubtedly, however, Paul means to signify, that no consideration whatever could cause him to waver in this judgment.—Κρῖμα=God's sentence of condemnation (*e. g.* Mark xii. 40, Lc. xx. 47; Rom, ii. 3; xiii. 12); this is conceived as something exceedingly irksome, a burden, therefore βαστάσει.

Ver. 11. **But I, brethren, if I still preach**

---

*[The verb here used means "to break up a road," so as to render it impassable. It originally took the dative of the person, but in the New Testament is followed by an accusative. LIGHTFOOT seems to think ἀνέκοψεν (Rec.) would suit the metaphor of the stadium better, its meaning being "to beat back," to hinder with the further idea of thrusting back (ELLICOTT), but the other reading is too well supported. He also remarks that the transcribers seem to have taken offence at the word ἐγκόπτειν, since it is frequently altered, e. g. 1 Thess. ii. 18; Acts xxiv. 4.—R.]

circumcision.—Paul refutes moreover the pretence of the false teachers, invented to further their cause, that he himself elsewhere preached circumcision. They had probably appealed, in support of their charge, to the circumcision of Timothy, which had lately taken place, but which by no means took place on the ground of its necessity to salvation (Acts xvi. 3. See moreover, the explanation of ii. 4).—"Still" dates not from a period within his apostolic career itself, as though Paul as Apostle had yet at one time preached circumcision, which in view of the manner of Paul's conversion and of his whole previous course is an unpsychological and unhistorical assumption, but it dates from his conversion. **Why do I still suffer persecution.**—This second ἔτι is a logical one: what reason remains, *etc.?*—**Then is the scandal of the cross done away with.**—Apodosis of the conditional sentence, "if I still preach circumcision," for the purpose of demonstrating the nullity of the protasis: he would no longer be persecuted.—Τὸ σκάνδ. τοῦ σταυροῦ more precisely =that, which is offensive in the preceding of Christ's death on the cross, namely, that it is proclaimed as the only ground of salvation. Had Paul, with this or instead of it, still preached circumcision as necessary to salvation, the Jew would have seen his law maintained in authority, and would not have taken offence at the death on the cross, and especially the preaching of it.

Ver. 12. Ὄφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονται.—The ordinary explanation is: Would that they would even have themselves made eunuchs, for which partly the middle signification of the future ἀποκόψονται is cited, partly the connection, which is thought to point (καί) to a play of words upon περιτομή. But, as this would be a bitter turn of wit, and as the assumption, that Paul means thereby to lash the sexual intemperance of the false teachers, is arbitrary, it is not pleasant to accede to this explanation. The lexical argument, which has the most weight, is the hardest to meet; it can only be said that the passive use of the future middle, even in the classics, is by no means unknown. On the other hand the connection, which is especially adduced in support of this explanation, has not a strictly demonstrative force, as WIESELER remarks. He, it is true, lays almost too much stress on the absence of an actual paronomasia; on the fact that Paul did not at least choose ἐκτείνειν, as being a very common word among the Greeks for castration, and the paronomasia with κατατομή (Phil. iii. 23) proves at least so much as this, that Paul in opposition to such Judaizers, was not particularly tender in dealing with περιτομή, for this is a sarcastic allusion to περιτομή. On the other hand this remark of his particularly is correct, that we should then expect instead of ἀναστ. an allusion to περιτ., the more so, as in ver. 11 περιτ. is not at all alluded to in the light of a demand made by them. If we can therefore make up our minds to take ἀποκ. as passive, this would be in itself entirely suitable, especially for the final sentence: Would they were even hewn off=condemned by God (since the reference to excommunication is less congruous). Καί certainly is far from necessitating the reference to περιτ., as with either explanation it is alike a climactic particle. [It seems entirely incorrect to take the passive sense, for which there is no authority in the New Testament. ELLICOTT, preserves the middle sense, and yet avoids the seemingly coarse interpretation, which is usually given. He renders: "would even cut themselves off from you." Unfortunately καί is a climactic particle, and this view gives us an anti-climax. In fact were there no question of taste involved, scarce a doubt would arise as to the Apostle's meaning. Have we a right to adopt forced interpretations, to avoid a natural one, because it seems to us unrefined? As LIGHTFOOT remarks "If it seems strange that St. Paul should have alluded to such a practice at all, it must be remembered that as this was a recognized form of heathen self-devotion, it could not possibly be shunned in conversation, and must at times have been mentioned by a Christian preacher. The remonstrance is doubly significant as addressed to Galatians, for Pessinus, one of their chief towns, was the home of the worship of Cybele, in honor of whom these mutilations were practiced." WORDSWORTH: "There would be more hope from their *ex-cision*, than from their circumcision. For then they would be excluded from the Jewish congregation, they would feel the rigor of the law, they would be ashamed of enforcing it on you. Then there would be good hope, that they also would joyfully hail and accept the gracious liberty of the gospel, and would be joined as sound members to the Body of Christ."—R.]—Ἀναστατοῦντες, **unsettling**=to bring into tumult, stronger than ταράσσειν. WIESELER: To render seditious, namely, against the order of Christianity, or rather against its Lord and King, Christ.—[CHRYSOSTOM: "Well does he say ἀναστατοῦντες, for abandoning their country and their freedom and their kindred in heaven, they compelled them to seek a foreign and a strange land; banishing from the heavenly Jerusalem and the free, and forcing them to wander about as captives and aliens." (From LIGHTFOOT.)—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Christian Liberty.* Respecting the idea of Freedom, which Paul in this Epistle maintains and vindicates for Christians with such decision (from iii. 25 on, substantially this, but more on its negative side; in express words in this section), we are to consider that it does not primarily mean freedom from the accusations and the curse of the law (wrath of God, etc.), but, agreeably to the whole polemics of the Apostle, means freedom from the claims (requirements) of the law, from the obligation of attaching ourselves to it, in order by works of the law to seek salvation (to seek it through these conjointly with faith, yes, essentially to seek it through these). Too precipitately and too prevailingly does Luther, for example, take this freedom, which Christ has won, in the former sense, and in this sense eulogizes it as the most precious benefit. Undoubtedly, however, freedom in this sense stands causally connected with freedom in the other; in the first place by the very fact that only he who through Christ is delivered from the curse of the law, is a Christian, and only to him does freedom from the law itself accrue (although

strictly speaking this does not belong here);—and secondly, inasmuch as only to him who does not give himself any more into bondage under the law, does freedom from its curse also remain assured, while conversely, whoever gives up the other freedom, loses also this, and thus comes into double bondage. Hence it is fully admissible to comprehend in the freedom which Paul claims for the Christian, his freedom from the curse of the law—not exegetically it is true, but at least in the practical application of the doctrine. Still more: in the reference to freedom from the curse of the law (wrath of God), an entirely just apprehension of the doctrine is involved, since Paul contends with such earnestness for the freedom of the Christians from the law, and against the imposing of the law upon them, and thus against their being brought upon the ground of the righteousness of works, for this very reason, that thereby we forfeit also our freedom from the curse of the law, and so come under this curse, losing thereby the advantage that we have in Christ, the certainty of the grace of God. His strong emphasizing of the freedom of Christians has its ground indeed not merely in an abstract pride of freedom, leading him to feel: Christians now have no longer need of allowing themselves to be held in bondage by a law, but it is grounded in the doctrinal knowledge of the loss of salvation, which would result from the giving up of that freedom.

2. *Either the law wholly, or not at all; either Christ or the law.* The Apostle presents two momentous alternatives and thereby sets himself against all half courses and their self-deceiving effect. The first is: "Either the law wholly—or not at all." Whoever once places himself in one particular on the legal ground, cannot stop short with that one. For in the first place the law, although a whole consisting of many members, is yet a whole in which one member depends on another. And secondly for this very reason the blessing of God is not promised to the observance of one or the other part of it, but only to the observance of the whole; whoever therefore will become partaker of the blessing in the way of law, must observe the whole law. But if he shrinks from undertaking the whole, either because he recognizes much of it as abolished for the Christian, or because much of it is burdensome to him, or as he thinks of the impossibility of fulfilling all aright, and of the curse which is denounced against all short comings, then let him give up the legal position altogether. This suggests then the other alternative: "Either Christ or the law." The two "do not match," i. e. whoever will be justified by works of law, thereby renounces virtually, and ought therefore to renounce formally the consolations of grace in Christ; for in so doing he does not seek his righteousness in Christ, but rejects Him. Commonly however man would be glad to take the latter with the former, would at least, without building upon it, be well content with the free grace of God, as the complement of his imperfect righteousness of works; but in vain—the sentence is: Fallen away from grace!—"This text, vers. 2 and 4, is a true touchstone, by which we may securely and certainly judge all manner of doctrines, works and ceremonies of all men. Whoever now, be they Papists, Turks, Jews, sectaries,—or whoever they may be, teach, that anything is necessary to salvation besides faith in Christ, they hear in this place the sentence of the Holy Ghost pronounced against them by the Apostle, namely, that Christ profiteth them nothing. But if St. Paul can venture to pass so terrible a judgment against the law and circumcision, which God Himself has given, what kind of judgment would he utter upon the chaff and the dross of men's ordinances? Wherefore this text is such a thunderclap, that by right the whole papal realm should be astounded and terrified thereat." LUTHER.

3. "*Waiting for the hope of righteousness.*" Justification, on one hand, is a benefit to be obtained even now, but on the other hand, that which we now obtain is not yet the whole, not yet the consummation. But the justification of the Christian in the present is not on this account in any way an illusion, nor is the joyful certainty, which faith has, of being justified in Christ, prejudiced. On the contrary the believer knows very well that at first he can only have this benefit in a measure corresponding to the imperfection of the present dispensation. The joyfulness of faith would be beclouded if the hope of consummation in eternity, in spite of all present imperfection, did not essentially appertain to faith, as *certain* hope. Hoping and waiting include, it is true, a negative element, a not yet having; but they also include essentially a positive element, the certainty that what is not yet possessed will nevertheless be attained, and this positive element is derived from nothing else than faith. Hope is grounded in faith—but never in our works; faith is therefore not only necessary in the beginning, but *remains* so perpetually; if we lose it, we lose hope also.

4. *Faith, Hope, Love.* Faith, that has hope, is the one thing that characterizes the Christian, to which is added Love. As in hope faith becomes a waiting faith, πίστις ἀπεκδεχομένη, so through love does it become an active faith, π. ἐνεργουμένη, *i. e.*, the ἐνέργεια does not first through love come into faith, but rather faith manifests in this love its own indwelling energy; had it no such ἐνέργεια in itself, there would be no such result as love, and where this energy is wanting to it, because it is a mere nominal faith, there is no such result. Even so the capacity of waiting does first come into faith, not through hope, but on the contrary, because this inheres in faith, from faith emanates hope.—The Catholic doctrine of a *fides caritate formata,* as the condition of justification, has of course not the least support in this passage; for the simple reason that "working through love" affirms something enirely different: "*non per caritatem formam suam accipere vel formari fidem, sed per caritatem operosam vel efficacem esse ap. docet.*" CALOVIUS. Nor can it be concluded from this passage that the Apostle would make love the principle of justification together with faith. See the EXEGETICAL NOTES above, but especially LUTHER, who has so truly apprehended the significance of our passage: "Paul treats not in this place of what Faith accomplishes before God, as how one becomes righteous before God; for this he has done at full length above; but he says just

here at the end, as it were for a short conclusion, what is a true Christian life; in Christ such a faith alone avails, which is no feigned, hypocritical one, but a true living faith. Now such a faith is one that exercises itself and perseveres in good works through love. For this is nothing else than to say: Whoever will be a true Christian man and in Christ's Kingdom, he must forsooth have a true faith. But now assuredly the faith is not sound, where the works of love do not follow after. Therewith he shuts out from the Kingdom of Christ all hypocrites, both on the right hand and on the left; on the right all Jews and work-saints, but on the left all slothful and secure folk, who say: If faith without works makes righteous, then God requires nothing of us than only that we believe, therefore we are permitted to do what we list."

5. *Love does not overlook perversion of doctrine.* Certain as it is that faith, active through *love*, is part of the Christian *life*, yet over against those, who destroy faith by perversion of *doctrine*, indulgence for love's sake, is not in place, but earnestness and severity (comp. the remarks of LUTHER upou this, in the HOMILETICAL NOTES, ver. 10).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. LUTHER:—Let us learn to count this our freedom, most noble, exalted and precious, which no emperor, no prophet, nor patriarch, no angel from heaven, but Christ, God's Son, hath obtained for us; not for this, that He might relieve us from a bodily and temporal subjection, but from a spiritual and eternal imprisonment of the cruellest tyrants, namely, the law, sin, death, devil, &c.—Those that will be secure and snore on without care, these will not keep this freedom. For Satan is to the light of the Gospel hostile above measure, *i. e.*, to the doctrine of grace, freedom, consolation and life. Therefore, where he is aware that it is about to dawn, he keeps no holiday, but sets himself speedily with all might against it. [CALVIN:—He reminds them that they ought not to despise a freedom so precious. And certainly it is an invaluable blessing, in defence of which it is our duty to fight, even to death. If men lay upon our shoulders an unjust burden, it may be borne; but if they endeavor to bring our conscience into bondage, we must resist valiantly, even to death. If men be permitted to bind our consciences, we shall be deprived of an invaluable blessing, and an insult will be, at the same time, offered to Christ, the author of our freedom.—R.]

[COWPER:—This is a liberty unsung
By poets, and by senators unpraised;
Which monarchs cannot grant, nor all the powers
Of Earth and Hell confederate take away:
A liberty which persecution, fraud,
Oppression, prisons, have no power to bind;
Which whoso tastes can be enslaved no more.
'Tis liberty of heart, derived from Heaven,
Bought with His blood who gave it to mankind.
* * * The oppressor holds
His body bound; but knows not what a range
His spirit takes, unconscious of a chain,
And that to bind him is a vain attempt,
Whom God delights in, and in whom He dwells.—R.]

Ver. 2. LUTHER:—Under the sun there is no more hurtful or poisonous thing, than the doctrine of human laws and works, that are received in the imagination of thereby obtaining forgiveness of sins. For they take away in one heap the truth of the gospel and Christ Himself.

Ver. 3. "A debtor to do the whole law." If we overlook this chance, and Moses begins in one particular to rule over us, we must thereafter be wholly and entirely subject to his power, whether we will or not. Therefore, to be brief, we cannot, yea, ought not, nor will not suffer, that any one should hang any one fraction of Moses' law [*Gesetzlein Mosis*] upon our neck.

Ver. 4. "Ye are separated from Christ."—How could one speak more powerfully against the law? What can or will any one bring up against this mighty thunderclap? It is not possible that the gospel and the law can dwell and rule in one heart at the same time with one another, but of necessity either Christ must yield to the law or the law to Christ. Therefore, when thou fanciest that Christ and confidence in the law might dwell together with one another in thy heart, thou art of a certainty to believe and know, that in thy heart not Christ, but the very devil dwells and keeps house, who under the form of Christ accuses and terrifies thee, and demands that thou through the law and thine own works shouldst make thyself righteous; for the true Christ has not that way.—Even as one that falls out of a ship, let it happen as it may, must certainly drown in the sea; even so can it not be otherwise than that whoever falls away from grace, must be condemned and lost.—If those fall away from Grace, that will be justified by the law of God, beloved, whither will those fall that will be justified through human ordinances, their vows and merits? Into the deep abyss of hell, to the devil.

Ver 5. SPENER:—Faith is not merely the beginning of our salvation, so that we must receive the first grace from God, and afterwards earn the rest ourselves, but all remaining gifts of grace and glory are alone expected and bestowed from faith.—LUTHER:—This is an admirable, noble consolation, wherewith all wretched, perplexed hearts, that feel their sin and are terrified thereat, are mightily holpeu against all the fiery darts of the devil. For when the conscience has to wrestle and strive in such distress and perplexity, it becomes terrified and anxious, and the feeling of sin, of God's wrath and of death is so great that it seems as if there were neither righteousness nor salvation to hope for. Then is it time to say: Dear brother, thou wouldst be glad to have such a righteousness, as might be felt, whereof thou mightest have joy and comfort, even as sin lets itself be felt and stirs up terror and despond; now that cannot be done, but do thou labor on, that the righteousness, which thou hast in hope, and which is yet hidden, may surpass the sin which thou feelest; and know, that it is not such a righteousness as lets itself be seen or felt, but as to which one must hope that in is time it will be reached. Therefore thou art not to judge after the feeling of sin, but according to the promise and doctrine of faith, through which Christ is promised to thee, that he may be thy perfect and everlasting righteousness.—STARKE:—Waiting comprehends in it; a believing assurance of certain attainment

of the thing hoped for, a high estimation of the same, a continual remembrance thereof, an ardent longing thereafter, a joy in the apprehension of future felicity, a patient expectation, an abstinence from all that stands opposed to the purity and steadfastness of such hope.—Those that will be righteous by the law have nothing more to expect of Christ but believers have yet glorious benefits to hope from him.

Ver. 6. LUTHER:—St. Paul points out here what is the fashion of the Christian life, namely, that it is nothing else than, inwardly, faith towards God and, outwardly, love and works towards our neighbor, so that a man becomes perfectly a Christian, inwardly by faith towards God, who does not need our works, and outwardly by works towards men, whom our faith can help nothing, but our works and our love.—Of faith, what it is, what its inward hidden nature, power, work and office is, has he treated above, where he says that faith makes us righteous before God. But here he conjoins it with love and works, *i. e.* he speaks of its works and office, which it outwardly and publicly accomplishes, that it is the stirrer up to good works and to love, yea not alone the stirrer up, but the true doer and workmaster of all good works.—There stands St. Paul and says outright, that faith, which worketh by love, makes a Christian, says not that cowls, fasts, distinct attire or genuflections make a Christian.—Anything else, be it called what it may, makes no one a Christian: only faith and love do so. See also above in the DOCTRINAL NOTES.

Ver. 7. In STARKE:—Running in religion is good, running well still better, to accomplish the race best of all. To a Christian life there appertains standing and walking: standing, that one may not fall, walking, that one may not stand still, which is commonly linked with a going back.—LUTHER:—These words are very comforting, for Christians have ever this temptation, to imagine that their life is an idle and sleepy matter, it seems more a creeping than a running. But so far as they remain steadfast in the wholesome doctrine, walk in the Spirit and wait on their vocation, they should in no wise trouble themselves, although it seems as if their work and doing went slowly on, and crept rather than walked. But our master, God, judges far otherwise. What seems to us slow walking, seems to Him quick and swift running, item, what we count for mournfulness, suffering, death *etc.*, that is with Him joy, laughing and blessedness.—"Who did hinder you?" And now they supposed, forsooth, that all their matters were going most prosperously and most swiftly along.—HEDINGER:—Have a care, pilgrim! on the way to heaven there are many stumbling blocks.—Hearest thou the sirens sing and the robbers whistle? Finish thou thy course with joy, let not the threatening and flattering of the world lead thee astray! The Lord is with thee!—LANGE:—Beware of all credulousness, especially in spiritual things, which concern the well-being of the soul! Let a doctrine wear ever so good a guise, it must nevertheless be tested by God's word.

Ver. 8. LUTHER:—The devil is a prince of persuaders. He can so blow up and magnify the very smallest sins, that he who is tempted, thinks nothing else than that they are so great and terrible sins, as are worthy the punishment of eternal death. Then is it high time that we comfort such a disturbed soul in such wise as St. Paul has here done, saying to it, that such persuasion is not of Christ, since it gainsays the word of the gospel, which depicts Christ to us, not as an accuser, but as meek and compassionate, a Saviour and Comforter.

Ver. 9. HEDINGER:—The least particle of evil infects, a single spark kindles a forest. Away with it! But O ye careless! is it a small thing to you, to be corrupted through idle talk and companyings, through poison of lies against Christ?

Ver. 10. LUTHER:—Has St. Paul done right in saying: I have a good confidence towards you, while yet the Holy Scripture forbids that we should have confidence in man? Answer: Faith and Love both believe, yet is the belief of the two not directed upon one thing. The faith is directed towards God, therefore it cannot be deceived: but love believes man, therefore is it often and greatly deceived. But yet the faith that love has is such a needful thing in this present life, that without it this life cannot at all continue. For if no man trusts nor believes another, what would this life upon earth become? Christians out of love believe people easier than the subtle children of the world are wont to do. For that believers trust people and expect good of them, that is beautiful fruit of the Holy Ghost and faith. But the Christian adds: In the Lord=so far do I trust you and expect good of you, as the Lord is in you and ye in Him, that is, so far as ye abide in the truth.—We must diligently distinguish doctrine from life. Doctrine is heaven, life the earth. In life there is sin, error, discord. Here love should pass by and overlook, should forbear; here should forgiveness of sins bear sway, yet so that one should not wish to uphold such sin and error. But with doctrine it is quite another thing, for it is holy, pure, unmixed, heavenly, divine; therefore can we not suffer it, that any one should distort it even in the least particular. Whoever will alter or adulterate it, against such a one there is neither love nor compassion.

Ver. 11. St. Paul holds that for a certain sign, that it is not and cannot be the true gospel, if it is preached in peace and in quietness and is not gainsayed nor persecuted. On the other hand, the world, when it sees that from the preaching of the gospel great rumors, divisions, scandal and tumults follow, holds that for a certain size that such teaching is heretical and seditious.—To murderers, thieves and other evil-doers grace is shown; on the contrary the world deems that no more evil, mischievous people are to be found than Christians; therefore it also persuades itself that they can never have punishment and torment enough inflicted on them.—As long as persecutions and suffering endure, the state of the church is good. The church must suffer persecution, if the gospel is purely preached. For the gospel goes about to preach alone God's compassion, grace, glory and praise, and on the other hand discovers the devil's craft and malice Where the gospel comes it cannot be otherwise,

there must follow the scandal of the cross; where that does not come to pass, there certainly the devil is not yet fairly hit, but only a little grazed.—May God be surety that the offence of the cross do not cease, which would soon come to pass, if we only preached, what the prince of this world with his members would be glad to hear, namely, how to be justified and saved by one's own works. [The offence of the cross. 1. It asks men to humble their pride and take salvation as a free gift; this is a great scandal. 2. It sometimes seems to cease: 3. It never does.—R.] The homiletical uses of the single verses, especially 1–9, are easily suggested by the sententious character of the greater part.

Vers. 1–6 From Lisco:—The care taken by the Christian, to stand fast in the true freedom.—Vers. 7–12. How are we to rescue those who stand in danger of apostacy? 1. By bringing to their minds their earlier life in communion with God; 2. by warning against the destruction to which they are hastening, vers. 9, 10; 3. by the testimony of our own walk and perseverance in fellowship with God through Christ, ver. 11. For vers. 1–6 at New Year. Frantz:—A good counsel at the New Year for all, who will strengthen their inward life: 1. Stand fast in the freedom, wherewith Christ hath made us free; 2. lose not Christ and fall not away from grace; 3. wait in the Spirit through faith for the righteousness that is to be hoped for; 4. walk in faith which worketh by love.

G. Extended exhortation to the Galatians, instead of turning back from Faith to works of the Law, to give activity to their Faith (in a right understanding of Christian freedom) by ministering Love, as the best fulfilment of the Law.

Chapter V. 13—VI. 10.

1. More general—reverting to the principle of ethical opposition between Spirit and Flesh, in a discussion, partly didactic.

(Chap. v. 13–24.)

(Vers. 16–24.—*Epistle for 14th Sunday after Trinity.*)

13 For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty [ye were called unto liberty,
brethren];[1] only *use* not liberty [or your liberty] for an occasion to the flesh, but
14 by [or by means of your] love serve one another. For all the [the whole] law is
15 fulfilled[2] in one word,[3] *even* in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.[4] But
if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of an
16 other. *This* I say then [Now I say], Walk in [by][5] the Spirit and ye shall not ful-
17 fill the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit
against the flesh: and [for][6] these are contrary [opposed] the one to the other; so that
18 ye cannot do the things that ye would [that[7] ye may not do what things ye would].
19 But if ye be led of [by] the Spirit, ye are not under the law. Now the works of the
flesh are manifest, which are *these* [of which kind are],[8] adultery [omit adultery],[9]
20 fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness [wantonness], idolatry, witchcraft [sorcery],
hatred [hatreds], variance [strife],[10] emulations [jealousy], wrath, strife, seditions,
21 heresies [caballings, dissensions, factions], envyings, murders,[11] drunkenness, revel-
lings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told *you* in time past
[I forewarn you as I did forewarn you], that they which do such things [as these][12]
22 shall not inherit the kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace,
23 longsuffering, gentleness [benignity], goodness, faith [or trustfulness], Meekness,
24 temperance: against such [as these] there is no law. And [Now][13] they that are
Christ's have crucified the flesh with the [its] affections and lusts.

[1] Ver. 13.—[It seems better to retain the Greek order, which places ἀδελφοί at the end of the clause. The aorist ἐκλήθητε may be rendered by the English perfect, but Ellicott gives the simple past tense as above.—R.]

[2] Ver. 14.—Rec: πληροῦται. The correct reading is that of Lachmann, Tischendorf: πεπλήρωται. So ℵ. [A. B. C. and modern editors.—R.]

[3] Ver. 14.—'Εν ὑμῖν before ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ is not sufficiently supported.

[4] Ver. 14.—[Lightfoot: "The received text has ἑαυτόν which some would retain against the authority of the best MSS, on the ground that it was altered by scribes ignorant of this usage of ἑαυτοῦ for the first and second persons. The case however with respect to the New Testament seems to stand thus; that whereas (1) in the plural we always find ἑαυτῶν

etc., never ἡμῶν αὐτῶν, ὑμῶν αὐτῶν *etc.*, as mere reflexives, yet (2) in the singular there is not one decisive instance of ἑαυτοῦ in the first or second persons; the authority of the best MSS. being mostly against it. See A. Buttmann, p. 99."—R.]

[5] Ver. 16.—[Πνεύματι. The normal dative (Meyer); the instrumental dative (Schmoller). In either case "by" not "in."—R.]

[6] Ver. 17.—Ταῦτα γάρ is to be preferred to ταῦτα δέ, as better attested. [The latter which is the reading of the Rec., and Lachmann is probably a correction, to avoid the repetition of γάρ. The Rec. and Lachmann also read ἀντίκ. ἀλλήλους, on insufficient authority; ℵ. K. L: the order is reversed in most MSS. and by the best modern editors.—R.]

[7] Ver 17.—[Ἵνα is considered telic here as usually, by the best commentators. "So that" must be rejected. See Exeg. Notes.—R.]

[8] Ver. 19.—[Ἅτινα has here a *classifying* force (Ellicott).—R.]

[9] Ver. 19.—Μοιχεία of the Rec. is to be rejected with Lachmann, Tischendorf. [So ℵ. A. B. C. Meyer, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth, Lightfoot.—R.]

[10] Ver. 20.—Rec: ἔρεις, ζῆλοι: the singular changed into the plural, apparently on account of the neighboring plurals. ℵ. has ἔρις. ζῆλοι. [The variations are great; the best editors now adopt the singular in both these cases. On the meaning of the words in these lists of vices and virtues, see Exeg. Notes.—R.]

[11] Ver. 21.—Φόνοι is to be retained, the preponderance of authority is in its favor. [Omitted in ℵ. B. by Tischendorf, bracketted by Lachmann, Alford and Lightfoot. Retained by Meyer and Ellicott, on the authority of A. C. D. E. F. G. K., most cursives and versions. The similarity in sound to the preceding word is quite as much an argument for retaining as for rejecting it.—R.]

[12] Ver. 21.—[Τὰ τοιαῦτα. "Such things as these," "all such things." "The article with τοιοῦτος denotes a known person or thing, or the whole class of such, but not an undefined individual out of the class; as in that case τοιοῦτος is anarthrous" (Ellicott). So in ver. 23.—R.

[13] Ver. 24.—[Δέ must be rendered "now" or "but", not "and." The two classes of deeds have been set forth, and this verse is a practical application.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 13. **For ye were called unto liberty, brethren.**—"For": Paul justifies the strong expression, he has used in ver. 12, against the false teachers. They deserved this rebuke, for—they seek to deprive you of your freedom, and yet—ye are called to that (by God through your conversion to Christ); therefore they strive against the counsel and will of God Himself.—To this thought: "ye were called unto liberty," Paul however now adds a restriction, a warning against misunderstanding and misuse of this liberty (which in all that precedes he had vindicated with such decision for Christians, and which he had made it their duty not to surrender): **only use not your liberty for an occasion to the flesh,** μόνον μή κ. τ. λ. We must supply, say τρέπετε=Turn not, use not liberty as a pretext for the flesh=let not the flesh (your sinful human nature) obtain in this freedom (from the law) an occasion to pretend that it is therefore now allowed to man to do what he will, and therefore it also may claim indulgence with its sinful lusts. This of course would be an entire perversion of Christian freedom, were the flesh thus allowed to take advantage of it. The antithesis shows distinctly, what Paul regards as the essence of the sarcical state; not by any means the corporeal nature, properly so called, but the selfish Egoism. For he exhorts: **but by your love serve one another**; love being conceived as the means of serving.—Δουλεύειν in happy antithesis to the ἐλευθερία of Christians. Christians are not to be servants to the law; in this sense they are free; but on the other hand this freedom does not exclude but includes δουλεύειν in the sense of "serving one another. [Lightfoot: "Both ἀγάπης and δουλεύετε are emphatic. St. Paul's meaning may be expressed by a paraphrase thus; 'you desire to be in bondage: I too recommend to you a bondage, the subservience of mutual *love*. Temper your liberty with this bondage, and it will not degenerate into license'."—R.]

With this verse a new section, of course, begins, but it is incorrect to begin here, as is variously done, a second or third main division. Above all it is not to be supposed that the Apostle henceforth addresses himself to those Galatian Christians who had held fast the principle of evangelical freedom; on the contrary he has throughout the whole Epistle the same individuals in mind, namely, those led astray by Judaism, and his present exhortation also is immediately connected with the leading thought of the Epistle. How nearly? This he, himself, plainly sets forth in the first place with μόνον μή: the energetic admonition to the maintenance of freedom receives its needful complement in the warning against misuse of the same, by the reference to its ethical character.—But this is unquestionably only one side, hardly more than the mere point of attachment. Paul gives his exhortation to serviceable love not merely as a precaution in case the Galatians, perceiving the inadmissibleness of the legal position, should desire to return to the freer one, but this also belongs, together with the entire explication which it receives in the following verses, to the polemics against their present erroneous view. To that legalism, which he combatted, as slighting faith, and surrendering itself into false bondage, he opposes as the truth, "the fulfilling of the law" by the activity of faith in love (comp. ver. 6), where we make ourselves servants, more generally in a walk by the Spirit, in which one is free from the law in the very "fulfilling" of it (vers. 14, 18, 23). He is the more earnest in holding this up to them, because the Galatians especially, in spite of (or on account of) their legal zeal, were wanting in this fulfilment of the law through a walk by the Spirit, a fulfilment which obliges Christians also (comp., especially ver. 15). The same persons who wanted to impose the law upon themselves, were content to be lacking in that which is the heart of the law; those who wished to make themselves servants to the law, would not be servants to one another. It was therefore of moment, to exclaim to these: Behold, what you need, is not in any way to turn yourselves away from faith, as if this were too little, to the law, but simply to make faith active through a walk in the Spirit, in love. Comp. ver. 6, and also chap. vi., where the more detailed exhortations follow. We thus see plainly how impossible it is to disconnect this section from the preceding one, how on the other hand it concurs with the entire polemics of the Apostle, nay, how these find in it their true, convincing culmination.—It is of course incorrect to oppose this section, as hortatory, to the preceding part

of the Epistle, as didactic, for this reason that the preceding part also includes exhortation (especially ver. 1); this however was dogmatic, and now comes ethical exhortation. Unquestionably therefore this section might with some propriety be called the Ethical part, in distinction from the Doctrinal; but if by this were meant, as commonly, that Paul now leaves the controversy concerning the relation of the Law to Faith, and, having no longer in mind the defection of the Galatian churches, merely proceeds to exhort to a walk of Christian morality, with reference to ethical short-comings, this too must be deemed incorrect according to what has been remarked. Moreover, even if such a distinction into a dogmatic and an ethical part is not unwarranted in fact, it is at all events not exact in form; this section cannot be formally contrasted with all that precedes. For certainly the discourse proceeds without interruption; Paul is speaking hortatively to the Galatians (especially from ver. 1 on), but on the ground of the doctrinal exposition, and now he merely gives a sudden ethical turn to this exhortation, bringing, as has been remarked, the whole to an appropriate conclusion.*

Ver. 14. **For the whole law is fulfilled.**—It is not easy to determine either the meaning of this clause, or its connection with what precedes. The first explanation, which offers itself on account of ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ, taken πληροῦται as= ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται, *comprehenditur*, as Rom. viii. 9. [So LUTHER, CALVIN, OLSHAUSEN, *et al.*—R.] But this must be rejected as lexically untenable. Besides with the reading [now generally adopted], πεπλήρωται it becomes at once incorrect. —As little does νόμον πληρ. have here the same sense as in Matt. v. 17=to bring out, to make evident the deeper sense, the ideal substance in distinction from the literal form. Doubtless it is not a πληροῦν in the doctrine that is here in question, and in reality, if πληρ. were taken in this sense, the explanation would come back again to the one already disapproved, namely, that the commandment of love to our neighbor is the substance of ὁ πᾶς νόμος, since that which is substance, in another aspect, is also foundation. Πληροῦν is to be understood of fulfilment by deed, conformity, *satisfacere legi.* [ELLICOTT: "The perfect πεπλήρωται suitably points to the completed and permanent act."—R.] It is peculiar then, no doubt, that this is said to be **in one word,** ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ, and this to be regarded as an abbreviated expression for: By conformity to the one word, precept (from Lev. xix. 18), immediately follows: **Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.**—[MEYER: "*Neighbor* is for the Christian, who rightly (Matt. v. 17) applies this Mosaic command to himself, his fellow-Christian (comp. ver. 13, ἀλλήλοις), as for the Jew it was fellow-Jew; but how little this is to be taken as *excluding any one* whatever, is shown by the whole spirit of Christianity, which finds its most beautiful expression in the case of the Samaritan (Luke x.); Paul himself was such a Samaritan toward Jew and Gentile."—R.] But how far does Paul declare obedience to the one commandment of love to our neighbor, an obedience to the whole law? Not in the sense in which Love is styled πλήρωμα νόμου (Rom. xiii. 8–10). Nearly related as the two passages appear to be, they must by no means be confounded. For in Rom. xiii. it is expressly stated what is to be understood by νόμος, namely, the individual commandments of the Decalogue which respect conduct towards our neighbor, and love is called the πλήρωμα of those, because, whoever has the *dispositions* of love, and in truth only such a one, will of course fulfil also the duties of love commanded by the law. But that "the whole law" in this passage is not to be arbitrarily turned into "second table of the Decalogue," nor even interpreted generally = Moral law, is plain; on the contrary, it doubtless signifies nothing else than: the whole Mosaic law. But in the second place it is also clear, that Paul cannot mean to say, that in love to our neighbor is found the pledge of the fulfilment of the whole law. For this latter Paul has not at all in mind, it is precisely the opposite that he is aiming at; his meaning is, that on him who does this there is no future requirement made in respect to observance of the law, that from this he is free. The sense of πεπλήρωται can therefore only be: He is to be regarded as if he had fulfilled the law, and therefore the law can exact nothing further of him. By no means therefore is the commandment of love to our neighbor regarded by Paul as the summary of the whole law: this would be entirely incorrect. He will rather say this, that if any one fulfils this, all the rest comes no more into account; of course, with reference to his emphatic demonstration in what precedes, that the law has lost its binding force for the believer. If the believer now does not take this faith to be a dead one, but quickens it through love, he has done all; there can be of further claims of the law upon him no mention, but he *ought* on the other side to have and exercise love, for only then can he regard himself as free from the claims of the whole land besides, only then, in fact, is he a believer.—If it is asked how Paul *could* view the whole law as fulfilled in love to our neighbor, especially without even mentioning love to God, this question is mostly raised with the understanding that he means to designate the commandment of love to our neighbor as the summary, or the fulfilment of it as the condition and principle of the fulfilment of the whole law; and if he meant it so, his assertion must unquestionably be declared unwarranted.* (Where the

*[On the division of the Epistle, see Introd. § 4. While we must guard against too formal division of the Epistle, we may distinguish it into parts without separating them or breaking the current of thought. The memory is much assisted by the convenient division of LIGHTFOOT: personal, doctrinal and practical. Whether the last named part begins with ver. 1, or here, is perhaps immaterial, since such distinction into parts involves neither the supposition that the Apostle made such formal distinction, nor an arbitrary view of the Epistle as a whole. We may mar the unity quite as much by insisting on too strict sub-division into sections.—R.]

*[Schmoller probably means to make an argument *ab impossibili* here, but the form of it is not pleasing. Certainly it were better to say: Paul could not mean this, for it is contrary to the teachings of his Master and inconsistent with his own statements elsewhere. MEYER remarks: "That, by citing only the command of love to our neighbor, Paul does not exclude the command of love to God, is self-evident to the Christian consciousness from the necessary connection of love to God and to our neighbor (comp. 1 Jno. iv. 20; 1 Cor. viii. 1–3); the context (vers. 13–15) led Paul to speak of the latter only."—R.]

former is in question, Jesus in Matt. xxii. 34 sq. places the two commandments together; and where the latter, Paul, Rom. xiii., restricts the law to the second table.) But this understanding of his proposition has been already designated as incorrect. He doubtless means to say: Of him who has love to his neighbor the law can exact nothing more. The question, rightly stated, is therefore only this: How could Paul attribute to love towards our neighbor so eminent a position, that he designates him who should fulfil it as free from all else? Must he not also, nay, above all, demand of the believer a fulfilling of the commandment of love to God, and could he, except on condition that both were found in a man, esteem it equivalent to a fulfilment of the whole law? As to this it is simply to be remarked, that (1) he conceives Faith as essentially comprehending love to God, and (2) cannot conceive love to our neighbor without love to God, and therefore in demanding the former from Christians, he of course does not mean to release them from the latter. He does not, however, mention love to God, for his exhortation has not respect to a merely inward fulfilling of the law, belonging to the disposition, but to that fulfilling of the law which comes into manifestation, and shows itself forth in the walk, to the true ethical conduct of the life, and especially of the common life, and this rests upon love to our neighbor. Therefore this only is made the subject of discourse.—If now the Apostle uses this proposition to establish the preceding exhortation (γάρ), this is not in the sense that he means thereby to represent the "serving by love" (ver. 13), as a divine duty because commanded by the law; after he has previously denied so decidedly that Christians are under the law, he cannot make the fact that it is commanded in the law a motive for the exercise of love. The principal emphasis lies rather upon πᾶς and πεπλήρ., on the circumstance that through serving love the whole law is fulfilled, in the sense given=enough has been done for the law, *i. e.*, negatively, they are therewith absolved from the rest of the law. Therefore nearly=Love one another: for therewith the whole ground of controversy, respecting the observance of the law, whether this or that precept is to be observed, is taken away. The whole sentence, therefore, serves rather to strengthen his exhortation than to give, strictly speaking, a reason for it. The commandment of love to our neighbor, although expressed by a citation from the law (Leviticus): ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλ. κ. τ. λ, does not therefore come into consideration as *a particular commandment of the law*, as if Paul from the other commandments, as being abrogated, excepts this one as remaining in force; only the commandment to exercise love towards our neighbor remains in fact valid for the Christian (and if it is done, the law has no further claim upon him); but *to him* it is a commandment not on account of the law, but *because* he is a Christian, on account of his faith in Christ, or because (ver. 6) "in Christ" alone "faith working through love" "availeth anything." Into the question how far the faith in Christ *obliges* to love, Paul does not enter, but he then goes on to show that this love is the operation of the Spirit, which faith brings. —While the proposition serves primarily to commend the exhortation, and while such an argument must have had the more weight for this end with those zealous for the law, yet of course at the same time it deals a blow against this zeal for the law, and exhibits its emptiness; for all the rest, the many observances are, according to it, purely superfluous; with the one thing, Love to our neighbor, all is done. [MEYER: "Paul looked down from a lofty spiritual level, and saw all other commands of the law subordinated to the law of love, that whoever had fulfilled *this* command, must be treated as having fulfilled the whole." The fact that Paul chose this particular expression, "the whole law is fulfilled," places his teaching in opposition to antinomian tendencies, just as the Sermon on the Mount shows Christ's position to the law, viewed as a purely ethical rule of life. "The whole law," *i. e.*, the Mosaic law, regarded in this light, was fulfilled in the case of the believer by this love to his neighbor; for the whole law of Moses had an ethical purpose, which purpose is now fulfilled to its full extent only when the believer, because he as a believer, is living "by the Spirit" has that temper of heart to God, which enables him to obey this "one word."—Schmoller insists too strongly on the idea that "all the rest are superfluous." It is doubtful whether this is implied even in ver. 18. The DOCTRINAL NOTES show his meaning more clearly.—R.]

Ver. 15. **But if ye bite and devour one another.**—This is=if ye intend of serving one another through love, do just the opposite: bear ill will towards and hate one another, and let this come into act, plot mischief against one another, yea, seek to destroy one another; something like this is the sense of these strong expressions borrowed from ravening beasts. Then **take heed**, adds Paul with incisive words, that the result be not the opposite of what you intend, **that ye be not consumed of one another.**—Each might be disposed to supplant the other, but in the end it will come to this, all will be wasted away. The sentence thus coöperates *per contrarium* to the establishment of ver. 12. The explanation: "your Christian community will go to pieces," I am inclined to regard as too special. It is not improbable, indeed, that this influence of the Judaizers occasioned divisions among the Galatians, and threw them into controversies upon the question of the law; yet I should not be disposed to refer this δάκνειν καὶ κατεσθίειν so definitely to that, as is commonly done. For this is at least intimated nowhere else in the Epistle.

Ver. 16. **Now I say, walk by the Spirit.**—With λέγω δέ Paul conducts his exhortation to serve one another by love (agreeably to the warning already given in the first half of ver. 13.) back to a more general, fundamental exhortation to walk by the Spirit (for in the Spirit he sees the Agent that leads to love), and then designates Spirit and Flesh as the two ethical principles opposite to one another, expressing themselves in opposite workings.—Πνεύματι περιπ. Dative of instrument; properly: walk through the Spirit, so that He is (not the path in which—WIESELER, but) the power, through which they walk=πνεύματι ἀγόμενοι, ver. 18. [The dative may be instrumental, as in ver. 18, but it is better, perhaps,

with MEYER, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, to consider it a normal dative, that by which, according to which they are to walk (almost =κατὰ πνεῦμα), for the reason that "Spirit" is contrasted in this passage not merely with "flesh," but also with "law," and the double contrast is best brought out thus, since under the idea of the normal dative, that of rule or direction is included. WIESELER brings out the same meaning, but takes the dative as instrumental.—R.] Πνεῦμα is here also doubtless =The Holy Ghost; it is this, that overcomes the σάρξ. He enters, it is true, into the hearts of believers, and works only by impelling and determining the walk, as He who dwells in the believers. But yet πνεῦμα is not on this account=the new disposition of the believer himself, sanctified by the Spirit, but remains ever distinct from the individual human spirit as Divine, transcending it. [MEYER adopts this view, and remarks that the absence of the article is not against it. "The distinction affirmed by HARLESS, that τὸ πνεῦμα means the *objective* Holy Ghost, πνεῦμα without the article the *subjective*, cannot be justified, since πνεῦμα has the nature of a proper name, and always, even when it dwells and reigns in the human spirit, remains *objective*, as the *Divine* πνεῦμα specifically distinct from the human (Rom. vii. 16)."—R.]

And ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.—We are led to construe this clause, as one of result, both by grammatical considerations (καί with οὐ μή and the subjunctive or future after an imperative has this force commonly) and by the context. In "walk by the Spirit" he indicates the means of victory over "the lust of the flesh." [On the grammatical point urged above, see the note of ELLICOTT *in loco*. He claims that the clause *might* be imperative, but "as there is no distinct instance of such a construction in the New Testament, and still more as the next verses seem more naturally to supply the reasons for the assertion than for the command, it seems best to adopt the future translation." (So E. V., MEYER also in 4th ed., and above.) This future with οὐ μή is strong: "shall in no wise" (LIGHTFOOT).—On the word "flesh," see DOCTRINAL NOTE 4.—R.]

Ver. 19. **For.**—This introduces, in the first place, simply the proof of a "lust of the flesh" (ver. 16)=of such an one I speak, for **the flesh lusteth**. Paul does not stop, however, but is led further to the antagonistic idea ἐπιθυμεῖν Πνεῦμα.—**Against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.**—Each principle combats the other, and seeks to wrest the dominion from it, and on the other hand to place itself in the possession of this. [It is scarcely proper to supply the verb ἐπιθυμεῖν with Πνεῦμα, but the Apostle's meaning is obvious. LIGHTFOOT suggests "strives," "fights against."—R.] This is explained by what follows: **these are opposed the one to the other, that** ἵνα=with the design, that **ye may not do what things ye would**, bring into effect precisely the desire which you have admitted into your will. Ἃ ἂν θέλητε is neither to be restricted to the good nor to the evil will. The inquiry whether the two powers in the cases in question, attain the object desired by them or not, is not proposed here, since the only purpose is to bring vividly to view the irreconcilable antagonism of their tendencies. WIESELER. Ἵνα is therefore not at all to be understood in an ecbatic sense. [ALFORD: "The necessity of supposing an ecbatic meaning for ἵνα in theology is obviated by remembering, that with God results are all purposed.—R.] The contest moreover is by no means to be conceived as an interminable one. The context shows that on the contrary there is expected of the Christian a complete surrendering of himself in order to be actuated by the one principle, the Spirit, and a *refusal to give way* to the lust of the flesh, whose motions, it is true, must still be experienced. The passage therefore, is entirely different from Rom. vii. 17 sq. [The reference is to "the free-will in its ordinary acceptation, subject only to this necessary and obvious limitation, that this conflict must be only predicated in its full extent, of the earlier and more imperfect stages of a Christian course. The state of the true believer is conflict, but with final victory." ELLICOTT.—R.]

Ver. 18 then speaks of the *victory* of this principle: **But if ye be led by the Spirit**=if the combat becomes a victory, and that on the right side: if the ἐπιθ. of the πν. becomes an ἄγειν. [BENGEL: *ubi* vero *spiritus vincit, acie res decernitur*. The dative here is instrumental.—R.]—**Ye are not under the law.**—This is according to ver. 14: there it was only stated specially of love, here generally of the "being led by the Spirit," which correspondence makes evident, how Paul regards its relation to the exercise of love; the two are to him essentially one, that is, the former is the principle of the latter. What in ver. 14 is called somewhat enigmatically a fulfilling of the whole law, is here simply and literally described as "a not being under the law." The latter is essentially identical with the former: the sense is: The law then can exact nothing more of you; implying naturally: for you are then in the right ethical condition beseeming the Christian, even though not carrying out every detail prescribed in the law. But if you—is the thought implied—are not led by the Spirit, you are then still under obligation to the law; for you are then in fact not yet all in Christ. [MEYER: "Through the impelling power of the Spirit you find yourselves in such a moral condition of life ('newness of life,' Rom. vi. 4) that the law has no power to find fault with you, to condemn and punish you. This explanation is the only correct one according to ver. 23: and this freedom is the true *moral* freedom from the law." So ELLICOTT, who remarks: "The more obvious conclusion might have seemed, 'ye are not under the influence of the flesh,' but as the law was confessedly the principle which was ordained the influences and works of the flesh, the Apostle (in accordance with the general direction of his argument) draws his conclusion relatively rather to the principle, than to the mere state and influences against which that principle was ordained." It must be borne in mind that Paul's use of the phrase "under the law" usually regards the law as a judge and pedagogue; here the Christian is viewed as one led by the Spirit, and thus taken from "under the law," but so led according to the law, as a guide to our new life of gratitude, that of the

fruit of the Spirit it is ever true "against such there is no law" (ver. 23).—R.]

Ver. 19–21. **Now the works of the flesh are manifest.**—*Φανερά*, evident=plainly conspicuous and therefore of course undeniable. This *φανερά* is the main point, and therefore placed first. For Paul wishes to furnish the Galatians inducement for being "led by the Spirit," and therefore he not only calls the works of the flesh "evident," but moreover carefully enumerates them, portrays them before their eyes (puts them in the pillory); so that every one may know, what conversely belongs to being led by the Spirit, that one may not practice such things, if he will be one led by the Spirit and not under the law. The positive side is then given ver. 22 sq.—That Paul does not mean to say that all of these things are found among the Galatians, is easily understood.—"Works of the flesh"="that which is brought to pass when the flesh, *i. e.*, the sinful human nature, and not the Holy Ghost, is the actuating principle." MEYER. Therefore naturally many sins are here enumerated, which are by no means carnal sins in the common acceptation, but rather in a very special sense sins against love, agreeably to the context. There are four classes: 1. Lust (*πορν.—ἀσελγ.*) 2. Idolatry (*εἰδωλολ.*, *φαρμ.*), 3. Contentiousness (*ἔχθραι—φόνοι*). 4. Intemperance (*μέθαι—κῶμοι*). The third class is treated the most in detail. [While we must not regard this specification as a charge against the Galatians in particular, it is extremely improbable that the Apostle would not choose such sins as most "easily beset" his readers. LIGHTFOOT very properly observes: "From early habit and constant association a Gentile church would be exposed to sins of the first two classes. The third would be a probable consequence of their religious dissensions, inflaming the excitable temperament of a Celtic people. The fourth seems to be thrown in to give a sort of completeness to the list, though not unfitly addressed, to a nation whose Gallic descent perhaps disposed them too easily to these excesses."—R.]—**Uncleanliness**, *ἀκαθ.*, lustful impurity in general after the special **fornication**, *πορνεία*; **wantonness**, *ἀσελγ.*, lustful wantonness. [LIGHTFOOT: "The same three words occur together in a different order, 2 Cor. xii. 21. The order here is perhaps the more natural: *πορνεία* a special form of impurity;* *ἀκαθαρσία* uncleanness in whatever guise, *ἀσέλγεια* an open reckless contempt of propriety. A man may be *ἀκάθαρτος* and hide his sin; he does not become *ἀσελγής* until he shocks public decency." As the reference in the New Testament is usually to sensuality, "wantonness" is the best rendering, "standing as it does, by the double meaning which it has, in remarkable ethical connexion with this word" *ἀσέλγεια*. See TRENCH, *Syn. New Testament* § xvi.—R.]—The transition from the first class to the second is easily found in the fact that with idolatrous worship many forms of unchastity were connected; but **idolatry** is not on that account to be considered as a species of lustful indulgence. [Yet the two forms of sin are so frequently joined together in the New Testament and the latter is so common a metaphor for the former in the Old Testament, as to suggest a more intimate connection than the simple fact that sensual excesses usually accompanied idolatrous worship. This fact must be regarded as an indication of some underlying affinity.—R.]—*Φαρμακεία*, here apparently, in juxtaposition with idolatry=**Sorcery**, not poisoning. [LIGHTFOOT: "'Idolatry,' the open recognition of false gods, 'sorcery,' the secret tampering with the powers of evil. It is a striking coincidence, if nothing more, that *φαρμακεῖαι* were condemned by a very stringent canon of the council held at Ancyra, the capital of Galatia, about A. D. 314."—R.]—Third class: the substantives up to *αἱρέσεις* have reference to dissension, the first four as shown in individual conduct, among which however, **jealousy**, *ζῆλος* and **wrath**, *θυμοί*, refer to the inner aspect, the source. [The latter is rendered "displays of wrath" by ELLICOTT, and thus referred to outward manifestations, which seems preferable, since the plural is used, serving to denote the concrete form of the abstract sin (so too the plurals which follow); were the reference to the source the singular were more appropriate. See TRENCH, *Syn. New Testament*, § xxvii., on the precise meaning of the word.—R.] The three following, **caballings, dissensions, factions** refer to the dissension of bodies of men.—**Envyings, murders** follow these, evidently named together mainly on account of the paronomasia, since *φθόνος* would otherwise belong with *ζῆλος*; "murders," however, fittingly closes the list as the culmination of discord. Besides, the two are perhaps put in juxtaposition with reference to the concurrence of envy and murder in the first murder, comp. 1 Jno. iii. 12. [LIGHTFOOT: "A principle of order may be observed in the enumeration: 1. *ἔχθραι*, a general expression opposed to *ἀγάπη*, breaches of charity in feeling or in act; from this point onward the terms are in an ascending scale: 2. *ἔρις* 'strife,' not necessarily implying self-interest; 3. *ζῆλος* 'rivalry' in which the idea of self-assertion is prominent: 4. *θυμοὶ* 'wraths,' a more passionate form of *ἔρις*; 5. *ἐριθεῖαι** 'factious cabals,' a stronger development of *ζῆλος*: 6, 7. hostility has reached the point where the contending parties separate; such separation is either temporary (*διχοστασίαι* 'divisions'), or permanent (*αἱρέσεις* 'sects, heresies'): 8. *φθόνοι*, a grosser breach of charity than any hitherto mentioned, the wish to deprive another of what he has; 9. *φόνοι*, the extreme form which hatred can take, the deprivation of life."—On **drunkenness, revellings**, ELLICOTT remarks: "the latter is the more generic and inclusive, to which the former was the usual accompaniment."—R.]—In order to brand still further "the works of the flesh," and to restrain from them, he points moreover to the punishment decreed against them, in words which are meant to express: that however often one might

* ["Observe the prominence always given to condemnations of this deadly sin, it being one of the things which the old pagan world deemed as merely *ἀδιάφορα*."—ELLICOTT.—R.]

* [WORDSWORTH:—"The word *ἐρίθεια* is from *ἔριθος*, a laborer for hire, 1. a mercenary; and 2. one who hires himself to a cabal for party purposes; and therefore signifies 3. a *venal partisan*; such as the factions of *gladiators*, and other ruffians hired by rival candidates at elections to intimidate the voters in the Roman forum. Hence *ἐρίθεια* signifies *venal partisanship*."—R.]

come to speak of them, he would always have to render the same judgment, and to express moreover that this judgment might be rendered in advance with perfect distinctness.—Προ in προλέγω and προεῖπον=before it comes; the preterite in προεῖπον=during my presence among you.—**Shall not inherit the kingdom of God.**—Just as in 1 Cor. vi. 9 sq.; Eph. v. 5, of course with the pre-supposition: If no conversion intervenes.

Vers. 22, 23. After the negative exposition, Paul now states explicitly in what the being led by the Spirit consists, or, more particularly, reveals itself.—**The fruit of the Spirit.**—Καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος, essentially the same as ἔργα, "works," ver. 19: That which comes to pass, which is brought into effect, when the Holy Ghost is the impelling principle. But in what follows it is only qualities that are mentioned, and not works, and so of course ἔργα was not appropriate. And certainly it is not unintentional, that Paul in the first place names only the inward "fruit of the Spirit," consisting in the disposition of the soul, for the reason that the Spirit primarily and principally changes and must change the inward disposition. When this is done, there is a genuine leading by the Spirit, living by the Spirit, which then finds external manifestation also in a walking by the Spirit.—The singular καρπός also is significant, "proceeding from the conception of the inward unity and ethical continuity of all that the Spirit works." As "Spirit" in this connection is conceived as the principle from which serving love proceeds, the enumeration of precisely these virtues is easily explicable. That many things besides are effected by the Spirit, does not need to be said. At the head stands **Love**, as the most general, and at the same time the chief virtue of Christians (comp. vers. 13, 14). Χαρά, one is inclined to take as **Joy** with the brethren, opposed to ζῆλοι, φθόνοι. It is no objection that this incidental idea is not contained in the word itself; the connection might easily indicate in what particular sense χαρά is here to be taken. Yet the explanation of it as the inward joyfulness of the Christian in the consciousness of the love of God may also be justified, as this too stands in close connection with his conduct towards his brethren, and is incompatible with an unloving behavior. At all events the following words from εἰρήνη to πραΰτης belong together, as designating the fruits of "love," unselfish love; εἰρήνη therefore denotes **peace** with others, μακροθυμία patience under injuries, χρηστ. gracious, friendly character, ἀγαθ. is nearly related to this: Benevolence (LUTHER); not so generally as, good dispositions (the special meaning is quite frequent in the Septuagint): πίστις here of course not=justifying faith, but either **trustfulness**, as opposed to mistrust, or faithfulness.—Finally, **temperance**, ἐγκράτεια, is added in antithesis particularly to the sins of lust and intemperance (vers. 19–21).—[Here again LIGHTFOOT is excellent: "The difficulty of classification in this list is still greater than in the case of the works of the flesh. Nevertheless some sort of order may be observed. The catalogue falls into three groups of three each. The first of these comprises Christian habits of mind in their more general aspect, 'love, joy, peace.' (The fabric is built up story upon story. Love is the foundation, joy the superstructure, peace the crown of all.) The second gives special qualities affecting a man's intercourse with his neighbor, 'long-suffering, kindness, beneficence.' (This triad is again arranged in an ascending scale; μακροθυμία is *passive*, 'patient endurance under injuries inflicted by others;' χρηστότης, *neutral*, 'a kindly disposition towards one's neighbors' not necessarily taking a practical form;* ἀγαθωσύνη, *active*, 'goodness, beneficence' as an energetic principle.) The third, again general in character like the first, exhibits the principles which guide a Christian's conduct."—ELLICOTT: "Ἐγκράτεια, 'temperance,' is distinguished by Diog. Laert. from σωφροσύνη as implying a control over the *stronger* passions, whereas the latter implies a self-restraint in what is less vehement."—R.]—**Against such as these there is no law.**—Τοιούτων is neuter, as in ver. 21, and the sense is: Such virtues the law condemns not. This, however, implies of course: Against those that possess such qualities the law is not, and this is the same thought, only more specially conceived, as in vers. 14, 18. The law requires nothing more of them, and therefore also it can bring no accusations against them. [Or rather, because the law can find nothing to oppose or restrain in such things (which fulfil its ethical purpose), the law has no power over those who bring forth the fruit of the Spirit. Schmoller presses too strongly the implied thought. BEZA and others make a *meiosis* here: these are pleasing to God, but as MEYER remarks: Paul wishes to explain only what he has said in ver. 18 of those led by the Spirit. He sets forth the fruit of the Spirit and says: *against virtues and states such as these the law is not*, and he thus makes clear, how those led by the Spirit by virtue of their moral condition are not subject to the Mosaic law. For whoever is so circumstanced, that a law is not against him, over him it has no power.—R.]

Ver. 24. **And they that are Christ's.**—Another proposition weighty in itself, and especially also in the connection. It joins on well to what precedes, with which it is probably better to connect it, although on the other hand what follows naturally connects itself with this. That is, as Paul went back from the exhortation to the exercise of love towards our neighbor to the exhortation to a walk in the Spirit, as the principle of love, so now he goes back beyond that again, and shows how this walk in the Spirit is itself grounded in fellowship with CHRIST. As thus, in the first place he spoke of the fruit of the Spirit, and then says: Now it is those that are Christ's, who have crucified their flesh, *etc.*; who therefore have crucified the very disposition opposed to the aforesaid fruit of the Spirit, the disposition from which the works of the flesh proceed, so that the opposite disposition, the fruit of the Spirit, can find a place. [ELLICOTT: "The connection of the whole paragraph appears to be as follows:—'The Spirit and the flesh are

* [Hence well expressed by "benignity." So JEROME, who renders this and the following word respectively: *benignitas*, *bonitas*. See TRENCH, *Synon.* 2d series.—The remarks of LIGHTFOOT are collated; the parts included in parenthesis are taken from his comments on the separate triads.—R.]

contrary to each other; if the flesh prevail, man is given over to all sin, and excluded from the kingdom of God: if the Spirit be the leading principle, man brings forth good fruits, and is free from the curse of the law. *Now* the distinguishing feature of the true Christian is the crucifixion of the flesh; consequently, it must be obvious from what has been said, the living in and being led by the Spirit'."—R.]—**Have crucified**, ἐσταύρωσαν.—This is conceived as something accomplished, and is therefore apparently to be referred to an individual act, the act of becoming a Christian through faith and baptism. The meaning, to be sure, is not, that now **the flesh, with its affections and lusts**, is not any longer present at all with those that have become Christians. But yet at least a walk in the flesh *should not* any longer exist in the case of Christians; we may declare to these that such a walk is in *contradiction* to their essential character as Christians, and that a walk in the Spirit may rightly be *expected* of them: yet this is only possible because we may urge this upon them: You now have crucified the flesh. It is to be noted also, that the language is not: slain, but, crucified. The former could not so well be said, as it is conceived rather as a task of the Christian to be accomplished only by continual effort (Col. iii. 5). In "crucified," however, the simple slaying is not the main idea, but the condemning, giving sentence, surrendering to infamous death; and this has necessarily taken place in becoming Christ's. [ELLICOTT: "Though this ethical crucifixion is here designated as an act *past*, it really is and must be a continuing act as well. This however the aorist, with its usual and proper force, leaves unnoticed; it simply specifies, in the form of a general truth, the act as belonging to the past, without affirming or denying any reference to the present. In all such cases the regular reference of the tense to the past may be felt in the kind of summary way in which the action is stated,—the sort of implied dismissal of the subject, and procedure to something fresh."—R.]—'Εσταύρ. naturally alludes to the cross of Christ, and the fellowship with Christ involves a crucifixion of the flesh for the very reason that it is fellowship with Christ's death on the cross; for through this the fact that men's σάρξ deserves condemnation and is obnoxious to death, is demonstrated and set forth in a way of irresistible force; for Christ indeed has only suffered what men have deserved on account of their sinful "flesh," and therefore what this itself has deserved. Whoever therefore appropriates to himself in faith Christ's death upon the cross, regards the "flesh" in himself no longer; for him in Christ's death this has been crucified. (Comp. Rom. vi. 6.) [MEYER: "'Have crucified the flesh,' expresses: to have divested themselves of all vital fellowship with sin, whose seat the σάρξ is, so that, as Christ was objectively crucified, we, by means of the entrance into the fellowship of this death on the cross, crucify the σάρξ subjectively, in moral consciousness of faith, *i.e.*, have made it entirely lifeless and inoperative through faith as the new vital element, to which we have passed over. To Christians considered *ideally* as here, this ethical slaying of the flesh is something which *has* taken place, in *reality* however, it is also something *taking place* and *continuing*."—R.] Παθήματα are passions, aroused by the σάρξ in the sensibility; these then show themselves active in definite sinful lusts, ἐπιθυμίαι. In the παθ. the man is, as is implied in the word passive; but this passivity becomes activity in the ἐπιθυμίαι. [Comp. Col. iii. 5, and see TRENCH, *Syn New Testament*, 2d series, § xxxvii.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Men are pointed away from the law and to faith, first and above all, because only faith in Christ and not the keeping of the precepts of the law, or the doing of works of the law, is the way to the attaining of justification and of the divine inheritance (subjectively: to the attaining of the comfort of the forgiveness of sins, of the adoption of children and the hope of the eternal inheritance). For him who has this faith, the law loses its importance, for the reason that a *usus justificatorius* it has not, while it has already fulfilled its *usus pædagogicus*, of impelling to faith, in the case of such a one.—But nevertheless the Apostle is the farthest possible from meaning that the believer on Christ is dispensed from giving a truly moral (ethico-religious) character to his inward disposition and his life (from the doing of "good works"), and is entitled to persevere in sin, that is, to indulge the "flesh." So far is this from being true that this, despite his faith and despite the fact that faith is the condition of salvation, nevertheless excludes him from the kingdom of God and from eternal life (v. 21; vi. 8). And, indeed, this *cannot* be the opinion of the Christian, for this his faith in Christ involves not merely an impulse and power to the avoidance of sin, to the willing and doing of good, but because it is a coming into fellowship with Christ's death, it immediately involves also the arising of a hatred against sin, a condemning of the flesh (ver. 21), and because it is a receiving of Christ, it involves also the beginning of a life for God (comp. ii. 19 sq. and the DOCTRINAL NOTES on that section). The latter fact, the new life, which arises or is given with faith on Christ, receives in this section its exact expression; there begins in man a working of the Spirit (πνεῦμα), who, overcoming the flesh (ver. 16), brings forth fruit in an ethically good, God-pleasing disposition of heart and life (ver. 22 sq.). Nay, it is *only* this faith in Christ which leads to this goal, as it is only this which leads to the other goal of justification. The law cannot effect this second, and quite as little can it effect the first. On the contrary, it arouses the σάρξ (and the ἁμαρτία dwelling therein), but does not assist to the receiving of the Spirit (comp. iii. 2, and Rom. vii. 8). So little therefore does faith in Christ dispense from a disposition and course of action pleasing to God, that it is just this, nay more, only this which leads thereto. If any one is disposed to call this disposition and activity to the Christian, thus conformed to God's will, a "fulfilling of the law," he does not name it wrongly; only in doing it he is to keep in mind (1) that it is not to be understood in a formal, but only in a material relation: a doing of that which the law commands, yet not *because* the law commands it, but in the strength and on the impulse of faith, or more

properly, of the Spirit, something therefore entirely different from what Paul calls "works of the law;" it is that which he so often names *ἔργα ἀγαθά*, works of the Spirit, rather than of the law; (2) that in this appellation law is taken in a quite restricted sense, of the properly ethical commandments (see Rom. xiii. 8 sq., where it plainly appears *what* Paul means by the *νόμος*; when he speaks generally, he uses the expression *ἐντολαὶ θεοῦ*, 1 Cor. vii. 19). "Fulfilling of the law" will therefore always be an only partially adequate expression for a Christian life, a conformity of the life to God's will. Entirely abandoning the Old Testament point of view therefore, Paul speaks directly of an *ἀναπληροῦν τὸν νόμον Χριστοῦ* (vi. 2).*

2. But it is true that the "doing of good works" the making faith active in a walk and mind pleasing to God, does not come to pass, as it were, of itself (as might appear from what precedes), even with the believer (even though, as of course is pre-supposed, his faith is an actual one of inward persuasion, and not merely nominal, is actually equivalent to a *τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἶναι*, and therefore bears within it the energy perfectly adequate to a moral renewal of the life). Even with the believer the *σάρξ* has not disappeared. Therefore, although abstractly we must say: the believer *cannot* dispense himself from a genuine ethical renewal of his life, yet *in concreto* we are rather to say: He *ought* not. The "thou oughtest" comes back even to him who stands on the foundation of faith. This appears in the case of the believer, in a twofold manner. In the first place and chiefly on the side of the *πνεῦμα*, which he receives in faith; for this works not merely as it were physically, in the form of an energy of nature, converting the will of man into agreement with the mind of God (and the figure of the *καρπός* must be understood *cum grano salis:* a bare *growing up* it certainly is not); the result is brought about ethically and not physically; the *πνεῦμα* also approaches the will with requirements, which it is true are far more intensive, which have as it were a quite different power of bending the will from the requirements of the law or of the conscience (the law of the letter or of the conscience); for they are strengthened by the persuasion which is received along with faith into the heart, of the condemnation of sin as well as the forgiveness of it, of the holiness as well as the compassion inhering in the grace of God in Christ. But it is with an "ought," however intensive, that the *πνεῦμα* in the believer approaches the will of man, and seeks to *determine* it to let itself be guided by him, to determine it to the *ἄγεσθαι* and then also to the *πνεύματι περιπατεῖν*: and in doing this he meets with many hindrances on the side of the *σάρξ* (ver. 17). — This is the immediate, inward "ought" that has place and is needful even with the believer. But to this inward monition and impulse of the Spirit, there must be added, in order to keep it ever alive and guard it against all impure admixture, one coming from without. Of this we have in this very section the speaking proof. The Apostle sees occasion given him to *admonish* the Galatian Christians with earnest words to a disposition and course of life answerable to their faith; he approaches them with an "Ought:" "So ought it to be with Christians = *because* you *believe* in Christ!" And his admonition here and elsewhere holds good also for us; it is the testimony of the Spirit conveyed through the *word—testimonium externum* (in distinction from *internum*)—the comprehensive exposition of which is the function of New Testament ethics.

3. That even the believer is not and cannot be spared the earnestly admonishing and impelling "ought" because even with him there is not found a steady will (on account of the old Adam), is the meaning of the church doctrine of the *tertius legis usus*, the *usus legis* with the *renatus* (the *us. didact.* or *normat.*), and understood in this sense it is correct. But as it is expressed it is distorted and incorrect, and is in conflict with the indisputable Pauline doctrine, that the believer is not *ὑπὸ νόμον*, that he may not be placed nor place himself under it. He is indeed under a law of the Spirit, so far as the Spirit admonishes, requires, rebukes, yet the Spirit does by no means merely this, but far more; this is the very least that he does. But especially is the believer in no sense whatever under the law of the letter, the Old Testament law, the proper *lex*, and with all its generalizing of the conception of *lex*, the *Formula Concordiæ*, nevertheless, in the section touching this matter does not really go beyond the Mosaic law. It does not arrive at the conception of the law of the Spirit (the law of faith), whether this is entirely inward, or expressed also in the word of Scripture (in the New Testament word of Scripture, which for the fulfilment of the ethical requirement presupposes the faith in Christ with what it has and gives). The law of the letter (the proper *lex*), has, it is true, its great significance for the believer, but it has its place not, so to speak, *after* Faith, but only *before* the same, as *pædagogus* (see above on chap. iii. 19 sq.); and in this sense it permanently *retains* its importance, and is indispensable for faith. That is, the sinfulness and imperfection of the new life even in the believer, make it needful that the law should not once only, but ever afresh, awaken in him the knowledge of sin and the impossibility of himself attaining salvation and eternal life, and by that very means drive him to assure himself of it in *faith* in Christ; and so ever impel him anew to faith. So far, therefore, as a *usus* of the *lex*, strictly so called, can be predicated even as to the *renatus*, it falls under the *usus pædagogicus*, as *usus secundus*. But in this pedagogy its function is continually exhausting itself again; *this function only does Paul ascribe to it*, and another, the

* [Whether theologians agree about terms or not, they all must recognize the fact that in so far as any law of God has a directly ethical purpose, it must continue to be binding on those who are Christ's. not binding as a law, with condemnatory power, so as to bring us again into bondage, after Christ has made us free, nor even binding on the conscience, so far as its punitive functions are concerned, but binding us with the cords of love, the bands of a man, a rule for the loving children of a Father, a guide for the glad gratitude of those whom Christ has made free. Thus far all that was of permanent ethical purpose in the Old Testament law must remain "the law of Christ;" to admit a change in God's ethics is repugnant to our souls. How much this includes is the practical question. which the New Testament itself answers in the life of Christ and the teachings of His Apostles. That it includes the Decalogue, that each and all of those Commandments are still in force, as a law, in the sense indicated above, there can be no reasonable doubt.—R.]

function *docere, ut in vera pietate vivemus et ambulemus*, *we* have no right to attribute to it, especially as we thereby come into conflict with the definite assurance that the law only stirs up sin and the *σάρξ*, and of itself continually hinders anew the Spirit's gaining dominion and therewith the attainment of the *vera pietas*. The law contributes directly neither to justification nor to the new life, and cannot therefore be directly the means of maintaining the latter. What it can and should do, was and is, to open the way for that which does lead to justification and to the new life, namely, Faith. As this is its work at first, so is it ever after. The *accomplishment* of these two things it must then leave to faith, first as that which lays hold of God's grace—for justification, then as that which has laid hold of it and therewith receives the Spirit. This Holy Ghost now, and not the *νόμος*, is alone in condition as the spirit of faith to assist to ever renewed victory over the *σάρξ*, partly through His teaching, partly through His monition, partly through His persuasion and drawing. For if the believer did right because admonished by the law, he would only attain again to *ἔργα νόμου*, but not to veritable *ἔργα ἀγαθά*.—Only so much is true, that *in concreto* very many a Christian, because faith has been with him from the beginning or has become only a name, allows himself to be guided merely by the law of the letter, at least if he has moral earnestness of temper, and thereby accomplishes nothing more than *ἔργα νόμου*, as to which he simply deceives himself, in accounting them perhaps for *ἔργα τοῦ πνεύματος*. More or less, moreover, does he seek in these *ἔργα νόμου* his justification also, and his hope; half-way at least, reckoning as the other half the merit of Christ, yet more in name than in reality. [It is only necessary to remark here, that Paul uses the word *νόμος* as covering the whole Mosaic law. That this whole Mosaic law has not the third use, of "teaching us how we may live and walk in true piety," is very evident. So also, that the new life of the believer is only a new life, in so far as it is through the teaching, monition, persuasion and drawing of the Spirit, must be believed and felt by the Christian. Still what does that Spirit teach and admonish us to do? To "walk even as he walked," all will agree. And how did He walk, that Master whom we follow?—He fulfilled all righteousness, He obeyed the law for us. Clearly then the Spirit, which receives of the things of Christ and shows them unto us, will show us as our duty, what Christ did, the complete obedience to God's requirements, and this will include all of permanent ethical value in the Mosaic law.—That may be *but* a part, yet it *is* a part, for what was in itself *right* at Sinai's foot is right at the foot of the cross. The Spirit is the Holy Spirit, Holiness is opposed to sin, Sin is opposition to God, it expresses itself in disobedience to His moral law,—the Holy Spirit must teach, admonish, persuade and draw us to the observance of whatever has been at any time an expression of God's moral law. The law cannot have a *usus pædagogicus* still, did it not convict us of sin; it cannot convict us of sin, unless its requirements are holy, and just and good; and as such the Spirit of Holiness must teach us the *moral* law still.—The controversy about the third use of the law, between the Lutherans and Reformed, seems to be one of terms. The only practical question that can arise out of it, is one respecting the obligation to observe the Fourth Commandment.—R.]

4. *Spirit and Flesh.* Πνεῦμα and *σάρξ* are the two polar antithesis, as the Apostle most vividly shows in this section, ver. 17. Πνεῦμα is the Holy Ghost, the Divine principle, that enters along with faith in Christ into the man, generating in him a divine temper and divine life, and that in conflict with the *σάρξ* and its *παθήματα* and *ἐπιθυμίαι*. Σάρξ is in itself simply (in antithesis to the Divine principle), human nature, of course the whole because the living nature, and embraces therefore body and soul. But it is not human nature on the side of its relation to God, but on the side of its alienation from God, on which side man with relation to God draws himself back upon himself, seeks himself and takes honor to himself, withdrawing it from God; in short human nature as sinful.—The use of "flesh" to denote human nature in general, is grounded in the Hebrew idiom, according to which בָּשָׂר is used by synecdoche for the whole man, and this idiom itself is in its turn, without doubt, grounded in the experience and Scriptural doctrine of the frailty of man, which induced the sacred writers to derive the designation for man generally, from that part of man in which his frailty is most conspicuous. As this frailty again has its ground, according to Biblical teaching, in man's alienation from God, there became connected with *σάρξ*, the established designation of human nature, the accessory idea of alienation from God=sinfulness. This took place in the proportion in which this view into man's alienation from God even from birth, as the deepest ground of his frailty, became clear, and in the New Testament, therefore, more than in the Old.—The expression *σάρξ*, therefore gives us no right whatever, to think of the bodily organism more than of the soul, and (with reference to the accessory notion of sinfulness,) to find intimated in the expression either the view of the derivation of sin from the body, or an especial reference to so-called fleshly sins more than others. (Comp. WIESELER's thorough exposition of this conception.) — The essential element in the idea of the *σάρξ* is the turning away from God and referring ourselves to ourselves, the self-seeking, egoistic element. This is primarily in respect to God, but immediately connected with it is the fact that a man in reference to other men also seeks himself, his enjoyment or his gain. It is easily explicable therefore why love appears as the first effect of the *πνεῦμα*, being the temper and act opposed to selfishness. In this section the Apostle has, it is true, special occasion to exhort to the love of our neighbor, but his speaking of love is not on this account merely casual. [Comp. on *σάρξ*, J. MÜLLER, *Christian doctrine of sin*.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 13. LUTHER:—The natural man understands nothing of the doctrine of grace; therefore comes it, when he hears this doctrine, that he straightway draws it down to his own lust and lewdness, and concludes on this wise: If the law

concerns us not and has no right to us, then will we live as we list.—How we at this time have seen in all ranks that all will fain be evangelical and enjoy the Christian liberty, and yet nevertheless the great crowd goes its own way; this one follows his avarice, the other his lewdness, the third his pride and haughtiness, *etc.*—RIEGER:—The liberty to which we are called by the gospel, is not so intended that we may tear ourselves loose from the law at our own will and please the flesh.—Into such a freedom the law can with honor dismiss man; for through Christ and the curse borne on the cross the law has its highest honor, and sin or the flesh wins thereby no advantage. For precisely that which was impossible to the law, namely, to bring to pass an inward enduring hatred against evil and an inward cleaving to good, from a willing heart, is accomplished by faith in Christ, and therefore the liberty of faith is not against the law.—HEUBNER:—By the side of the highest good stands the highest evil, by the side of freedom, lawlessness. No word has been so abused and desecrated, as Freedom.

LUTHER:—"By love serve one another." We must diligently teach in religion both sorts of doctrine, of Faith and Works; yet so that we carry neither too far. Else, where one teaches Works alone, he loses Faith, but if one teaches concerning Faith alone, forthwith gross, carnal men begin to dream that works are not necessary. Yet must the doctrine of Faith be planted first, or it cannot be understood what good works really are.—Although we have been justified, yet have we still sin in us, which rhymes as ill with good works as with faith, but draws us away from both. Besides flesh and reason is so disposed that it has by nature all its delight and pleasure in Pharisaic and superstitious works, and does those works with far greater earnestness which itself has chosen, than those which God has commanded. Therefore have rightminded preachers as much to do, in admonishing the people to genuine love and really good works, as in teaching genuine faith.—Christians must consider thus, that in their conscience they are indeed free from the curse of the law, sin and death, but as to the body they are servants, for therein should one serve another by love.

Ver. 14. It is needless for any one to trouble you with circumcision and Moses' ceremonies; see to this before all things, that you remain steadfast in the doctrine of faith. Will you after that do good works, as indeed you should, I will with a single word point out to you the noblest and greatest of all works, which ye should do, that ye may fulfil all laws: Love one another! Therefore the true, perfect doctrine and Christian theology of Faith and Love is in long and in short this: Believe on Christ, love thy neighbor as thyself! It is most short, to look upon the words, but if it is to be practical, it is broader, higher and deeper than heaven and earth.—The reason imagines it a very low thing, to say nothing of its being an act of God's service, for one to help the other by love, *i. e.*, for one to instruct and set aright a wanderer, comfort a mourner and afflicted, support the weak, for every one to help his neighbor, as he can, and make up for that which he lacks; *item*, for one to be obedient to government, hold his parents in honor, to have patience at home and bear with a whimsical, strange-tempered yoke-fellow, with ill-mannered servants, *etc.;* all which amounts to this: By love serve one another. But believe me, they are not contemptible and mean, but excellent and precious works, because God has commanded them and they please Him. It is of no concern therefore, whether the world looks upon them as mean and contemptible or not.—It is a short word, but excellently and powerfully spoken: Love thy neighbor as thyself! We cannot give any one a better, more certain and more exact example, how he should love his neighbor, than if we say to him that he should love him so as he loves himself. Nor can one have a better, nor nobler virtue than Love, and this high virtue can be directed towards nothing better than towards our neighbor.—If thou wouldst know how thou shouldst love thy neighbor, consider diligently how dear thou art to thyself, that thou wouldst gladly have help and counsel given thee, if thou wert in distress and necessity, as much as all creatures could. Therefore needest thou no book, out of which to learn how thou shouldst love thy neighbor.—RIEGER:—The call of the gospel to Christ and the grace which has come by Him, the sense of being one Spirit with Christ, brings us under the law of Christ, where in love we have all at once, and assumes also the willingness to serve one another through love. The warding off the claims of faith in the gospel with the pretext of love to man, is a critical sign of our times.

Ver. 15. STARKE:—Hatred, envy and reviling are as the teeth of snakes and lions. What shame, that among Christians there is such an evil kind of people!—What mean these wearisome, and mischievous lawsuits?—LANGE:—Each vice brings in time some punishment with it, as every virtue has in advance some recompense. For even as love does him good that cherishes it, so does hatred and contention bring nothing but disquiet and ill-content, and indeed injures the body also in health.—RIEGER:—The biting begins on good pretexts; but men easily go further, to do mischief to the property, to disparage the merits, *etc.*—ROOS:—To bite and devour one another, is not only the wont of the populace, but also the way of many learned men, whereof their learned journals, reviews, *etc.*, bear witness. And so do they devour one another mutually, *i. e.*, they destroy altogether one another's credit and the usefulness which each yet had, perhaps also a part of their life. Their *esprit* is flesh, what may then the rest be?

Vers. 16, 17. LUTHER:—Paul means by lust of the flesh not alone unchastity, but also all other sinful cravings, whereby the saints are tempted. —It is impossible that you can follow the Spirit in all things whatever and not also feel the flesh, and that you should remain unhindered by it; yea, it will hinder you and so hinder you that you will not be able to do what you gladly would do. In this all that you can do is to withstand the flesh, which quickly becomes inflamed with anger, impatience, *etc.*; murmurs, hates, bites, becomes angry against God, falls into doubting; and to follow the Spirit, which admonishes you to peace, patience, hope, faith. To know this is for believers most profitable and comforting.

When I was yet a monk, I often thought that I must be lost, when I felt an evil temptation. Then undertook I many kinds of discipline, confessed every day, and yet it all helped me nothing. For the same temptations evermore recurred; therefore tormented I myself perpetually with such thoughts: See, there you have committed such and such a sin, *etc.*, therefore there is no help for you, all your good works are come to nothing. Had I then rightly understood St. Paul's words, I would not have tormented myself so severely, but would have considered with myself, as I am now wont to do: Dear Martin, it amounts to nothing, your leading an angelical life here on earth; so long as you live in the flesh, it will not give over its way. Yet do not therefore despond, but withstand it through the Spirit, that thou mayest not fulfil its lust, and it cannot hurt thee, because thou art in Jesus Christ. —Whoever thinks that a Christian must have no fault at all in him, and yet feels that in himself there are many and manifold shortcomings, such a one must at the last be consumed of melancholy. But whoever understands it, him must such temptation of the flesh, *i. e.*, evil, serve for his best good. For when the flesh will tempt to sin, he is led with earnestness to pray, to seek forgiveness of sins through Christ, to lay hold of the righteousness of the law, after which perhaps he would never have so greatly longed.—It is to Christians profitable and good that they feel such troublesomeness of the flesh, that they may not become proud over the supposed righteousness of their works, as if they were in favor with God on account of the same.

STARKE:—The contest of the flesh and the Spirit exists alone in the regenerate. The conflict which exists in an unregenerate man, so that he does not fulfil all evil lusts that stir in him, is only a conflict of the reason with its natural impulses and gross sensual desires. This is to be carefully distinguished from the former, that one may not, because he feels within himself a struggle against sin, immediately reckon himself regenerate.—The strife of the Spirit against the flesh is an infallible token of regeneration and a state of grace, and is distinguished from the strife which is waged by the mere powers of reason in this, that the former always wins the victory.—These words are misused by the children of the world to this effect, that it is vain to strive after a holy character, because we cannot, after all, do what we would. But mark, what the regenerate, who are spoken of here, will according to the Spirit, and what according to the flesh. They are not aiming first to obtain the dominion over sin, for this they have already, but they would fain quench and be rid of everything sinful; but this, on account of the flesh cleaving to them, they cannot do. According to the flesh they would fain let sin come to dominion again, but that they do not, because the Spirit strives against it and overcomes the flesh. Therefore it follows from this, that a believer can by all means live holy, but here can arrive at no perfection.

RIEGER:—The flesh and the sin which cleaves to the same, lust and its allurements and enticements we indeed experience, nay more, there may also occur cases where it is not as plain as we could wish that the lust has not been admitted and treacherously taken the will with it. But by renewal in the spirit of the mind one may always count himself to be no debtor to the flesh, to fulfil its lusts, but may take the curse from Christ's cross and hang it upon the flesh, and from Christ's Spirit may gain the willingness to separate therefrom. Between the strivings of the Spirit and of the flesh against each other it must become evident, which way the man, after receiving sufficient strength, is bending his will, and on which side he takes his stand. If the Spirit's impulses and leadings continue with a man and if he is honestly minded to obey the Spirit and its holy opposition to the flesh, he does not indeed deny the law the right to show him his imperfections, but he is not under it, and is not at the last judged by it. Christ has taken the believer under His atoning shield against the curse of the law, and has moreover bestowed on him His spirit, which impels him as to all other good, so also to combat for this faith, although there is many a conflict and many a doubt before he can without ceasing so believe and act.

Ver. 19. LUTHER:—It is a very different thing to be tempted by the flesh, and yet not to follow its lusts, but to walk in the Spirit and strive against them, from what it is to consent to the lust of the flesh and abide therein and nevertheless to make great boast of the Spirit, and to make as though one lived Christianly. The former St. Paul comforts, in that he says: Because they are ruled by the Spirit they are not under the law; but the others he threatens with everlasting damnation, in that he declares: They that do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven.—SPENER:—By works of the flesh, Paul, it is true, understands principally actual outward, outbreaking deeds, but he does not thereby exclude inward vices, which are also rightly called works of the flesh. Nay, as respects the outward sins themselves, their sinfulness consists not merely in the outward deed itself, but in the evil and prevailing inclination thereto. Therefore is one guilty of adultery, fornication, gluttony, drunkenness, quarrelsomeness, *etc.*, who allows such vices to gain the upper hand in his soul, even though from want of opportunity, or fear of infamy or trouble he restrains himself from the outward act; for God looks on the heart and its longings.

"Drunkenness, revellings." In STARKE:—The Apostle is not speaking merely of the habit and custom of drinking; therefore it is a false excuse if any one thinks that a debauch is no sin if only one does not make a business of it. The devil invented this excuse. When any one so overfills himself that he is unfit for prayer and the business of his calling, that is drunkenness; what then are we to think of the respectable world with its sinful and damnable Christian drinking bouts? and what too of this continual drinking of healths, than as of a temptation to swill down liquor?—"They which do such things." It is not said: They that do such things daily; for even though one does any such thing only now and then, on certain occasions, yea even only once, but voluntarily, he forfeits the kingdom of God, so long as he remains under the

dominion of this work of the flesh. Nor is it said: They that do all this. It is not needful for a man to do all these sins or many such, to fall under the penalty, but it is enough, if a man lets one single sin rule over him, let it be what it will. Now it rules over him, not only while he is committing it, but so long as the purpose never to commit it again, is not yet fully fixed.—They shall not only not procure eternal life by their works of the flesh (as may well be supposed), but, if they set their hopes, not upon earning eternal life by their works, but receiving it as a gift to be received by faith, they will not, leading a dissolute life, inherit it any more than earn it.—He inherits not the kingdom of grace, still less the kingdom of glory, even though his funeral sermon extols him as blessed, surely, very, or even most blessed.

Ver. 22. It is not enough to flee the manifest works of the flesh, but we must bring true virtues to take their place. The Spirit of Christ must water and warm the hearts of men with His heavenly consolation, if they are to be fruitful to good works.—"Works of the flesh," said Paul, as being what comes into view and can be apprehended by reason alone, as to what they are, and that they are evil; but he does not use this term of the fruits of the Spirit as being for the most part internal, and although they express themselves in outward works, yet they cannot be comprehended and judged by the mere reason; nay, reason, should she pronounce a judgment, would be more apt to pronounce a judgment against them. Indeed, the fruits of the Spirit often exist in good measure in those, who yet in true poverty of Spirit complain of the lack of them.—Roos:—All these fruits are found in every spiritual man, although in one this, in another that fruit is more richly possessed.

Luther:—*Joy.* This means the loving discourse of the bridegroom and his bride, *i. e.*, the joyful, loving thoughts, which a believing heart has concerning Christ, the wholesome admonitions, the joyful hymns, thanksgiving psalms and songs of praise, with which Christians admonish and cheer one another. The Scripture testifieth once and again, that God had no pleasure in the sadness of the spirit, but wills, that we be joyful in Him. Therefore also He sent His Son, not to make us perturbed and mournful, but joyful. Therefore do the Prophets, Apostles and Christ Himself admonish, yea, command us, that we be glad and joyful. Where this spiritual joy is, there does the heart inwardly rejoice through faith in Christ, and moreover shows forth such joy outwardly with words and gestures; yea, it can be joyful even in the midst of affliction and death. Such joy is to the world unknown.—*Patience.* This is a virtue of such sort, that one does not alone endure and suffer waywardness, ill-luck, wrong, *etc.*, but also bears long with those that do him such evil, and waits if perchance they may at some time amend themselves. The devil has this way, that when he cannot in tempting us overcome by main force and might, he watches nevertheless with wearisome continuance, and worries us out if he can, for he knows well what weak, earthen vessels we are, that cannot at the last endure violence and repeated hard strokes; therefore he oft gains great advantage, in that he perseveres so long and diligently.—*Gentleness.*—This is: that one is so disposed, that every one gets on well with him and loves to deal with him. For Christians should not be unfriendly and cross-tempered people, but mild, courteous, friendly, such as every one loves to consort with, who bear with others' faults, are easy to give way to others, and can put up with the whim of others. Such a courteous friendly man was our Lord Jesus Christ, as we see in the Gospel from beginning to end.

In Starke:—*Goodness*—All nature is to us a mirror of kindness. For where is there a creature that does not serve and do good to man? For us the sun shines, for us the earth bears fruit, us does the heaven cover, to us does the air minister breath, everything stands at our command; should we then be the only ones not to practice kindness?—Luther:—*Faith.*—He that has this faith, such an one suspects no evil of other people, but has a loving, simple heart towards every man; and although he be deceived, he yet remains long-suffering and kind, and forbears with him that hath deceived him. *In summa*, he believes every man and yet puts his confidence in no man but alone in God.—Roos:—Against spiritual men the law is not, for although they are not without fault yet they are wholly under grace (Rom. vi. 14), and are partakers of the blessing in Christ Jesus (Gal. iii. 13, 14). There are people, who imagine themselves to have preached the gospel, when they encourage others, by a human persuasion, to let go the Jewish way of thinking, not anxiously to count this or that for a sin, and to entertain no scruple about permitted things. But although such persuasions, addressed to a natural man, may bring about a show of freedom, and such a man may then imagine that he is no longer under the law, though he really is, yet the great question remains, whether the law is not against him. The right of the law to curse him, is not an usurpation, but a well-founded, sacred right, to which there is nothing to oppose but Christ's death on the cross. Has then every one who boasts of freedom become a believer in this crucified Saviour? And has he also, by means of this faith, become spiritual, so that he exhibits the fruit of the Spirit within him? It is only against such that the law is not.

Ver. 24. "Have crucified the flesh."—Starke:—This word well expresses how sin must, little by little, be disabled and slain, for the crucified man did not die at once; he was first made fast with nails to the cross and then kept there, till through the loss of blood and through hunger and thirst he became weaker and weaker, and finally died. In the beginning of repentance the old man is nailed to the cross, and then in conversion he is fastened to it anew, when he gets a hand or a foot free; the soul carefully avoiding all occasions whereby evil lusts can be aroused, until indwelling sin is more and more disabled by all manner of acts of repentance and devotion, which are contrary to corrupt nature, which acts must extend through the whole life. But now all power to crucify the flesh is to be derived from Christ's death on the cross.

Rieger:—They that have ceased from the

law and all endeavors to obtain life and righteousness therefrom, and on the other hand belong to Christ and accept Him as the source of their life and holiness, such keep their flesh crucified. They are and live yet in the flesh, to be sure, and so experience how close sin cleaves and how heavy it weighs; they experience the enticements of inward lust, but they have learned from the gospel the meaning of God in the cross of Christ, and have believed it, and can believe the judgment executed on the body of their Redeemer as in God's eyes in force also against their own flesh. And indeed they desire no rest for the flesh, but impose on it the curse, which through Christ's cross is imposed thereon, and behold this wearisome and painful dying with a hope gathered out of the gospel.

On vers. 13–15. Christianity and Freedom: (1) How little we have occasion, on behalf of freedom, to repent of being Christians and becoming Christians more and more; (2) how deeply we must rue that freedom which we do not establish and confirm by the power of Christ.—The Christian is free and yet a servant of all.—The right union of Freedom and Love (1) needful (2) difficult.—By love serve one another! (1) An actual (2) but also a blessed service.

On vers. 16–24: Walk in the Spirit, *etc.*, ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh: (1) the lust of the flesh, (2) the resisting of it in the Spirit.—The walk in the Spirit; (1) is not accomplished without conflict (ver. 17) (2) but saves from destruction (vers. 19–21), (3) leads to a glorious goal (ver. 22).—With his exhortations to walk in the Spirit (1) the Apostle places us upon a fearful battle-field (ver. 17), (2) gives us the view into a frightful abyss (ver. 19 sq.), (3) leads us into a lovely garden (ver. 22 sq.). The conflict of the flesh and the Spirit: (1) in what does it consist? (2) to what should it impel?—Temptations through the flesh must come: despond not!—but must be combatted and overcome through the Spirit: be not careless!—There is no believer so holy or strong that he does not feel his flesh, but also none so weak that he cannot withstand it.—The motions of the flesh a damper to pride, a testimony against self-devised spiritualism.—Three times three fruits of the Spirit; a lovely garland.—To have crucified the flesh a token that one is Christ's.—Who can crucify his flesh? Only he who is Christ's.—The crucifying of the flesh (1) takes place indeed, when one is Christ's, but (2) does not of itself make certain that one is Christ's.

Kapff:—Under what law is the believer? (1) Not under that of the flesh, (2) not under that of Moses, but (3) under that of the Spirit.—Rautenberg:—The crucifixion of the flesh: a token of true Christianity, a work of the Holy Ghost, a victory of Christian freedom, a progress to inward peace.—In Lisco:—The conflict of the Spirit with the flesh: (1) Where does it arise? Only where a life in the Spirit is begun. (2) Why is it necessary? *a*) On account of the inward incompatibility of flesh and Spirit, *b*) on account of the consequences, which proceed therefrom, good or evil fruits. (3) How should it end? By the Spirit's overcoming the flesh.—The walk in the Spirit: (1) It kills the works of the flesh, (2) it brings in its place the fruits of the Spirit.—Flesh or Spirit? Choose! (1) The flesh is thy destruction; (2) the Spirit creates divine life; (3) as Christians we are bound to the life of the Spirit.—(*Fast-day Sermon*): The call on Fast-day: the works of the flesh are manifest. (1) What works are works of the flesh: (2) what those have to expect, who do such works.—(*Whit-Sunday Sermon*): We are partakers of the Holy Spirit only when we do the works of the Spirit.—Genzken:—What do we yet lack of a walk in the Spirit? (1) The beginning is, that the flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh, and many have not even advanced so far; (2) the next step is, that we no more fulfil the lusts of the flesh, and many are not even ashamed of the manifest works of the flesh; (3) the consummation is, that we bring forth the fruits of the Spirit, and from that we are all yet far distant.—Greiner:—Flesh and Spirit: (1) they are contrary one to the other; (2) their ways lead asunder in time and eternity.—Engelhard:—The life of that man, who is ruled by the Spirit of God: (1) He breaks with sin and mortifies daily the old man; (2) he is filled with the fruits of righteousness, which do not conflict with the law, but which can never be accomplished under the dominion of the law; (3) and receives accordingly the most excellent of all rewards, the inheritance of the kingdom of God.

Vers. 13–24. Frantz:—Beware that ye do not, through freedom, give a handle to the flesh, for (1) freedom in Christ is not without law; it has its law, only not in the members, but in Christ, which law is love. (2) It is not without control; but its control is exercised not by the flesh, but by the Spirit.

2. More special Admonition to the Walk in the Spirit (to serving Love), or warning against excessive self-valuation and envious selfishness.

(CHAP. v. 25, 26.—vi. 1-10.)

(Epistle for the fifteenth Sunday after Trinity.)

25, 26 If we live in [by][1] the Spirit, let us also walk in [by] the Spirit. Let us not be desirous of vain-glory [become vain-glorious], provoking one another, envying one another.

a. Warning against unloving self-exaltation above others (vi. 1-5).

VI. 1 Brethren, if [even if][3] a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which [who] are
spiritual, restore such a one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou
2 also [shouldst] be tempted. Bear ye one another's burdens, and so [or thus shall
3 ye] fulfil[4] the law of Christ. For if a man think himself to be something, when he
4 is nothing, he deceiveth himself. But let every [each] man prove his own work,
and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another [his ground of
boasting only in what concerneth himself, and not in what concerneth the other].[5]
5 For every [each] man shall bear his own load.[6]

b. Warning against envious selfishness.—Admonition to unweariedness in doing good, especially to teachers of the word (vers. 6-10).

6 Let [But let] him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in
7 all good things. Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man sow-
8 eth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his [own] flesh shall of the flesh
reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life ever-
9 lasting And [But] let us not be weary[7] in well doing: for in due season we shall
10 reap, if we faint not. As we have therefore [Accordingly then as we have][8] opportunity, let us do good[9] unto all *men*, especially unto them who are of the household of faith.

[1] Ver. 25.—[The dative Πνεύματι has perhaps a slightly different force in each member of this verse, but "by" will express the meaning in each case, better than "in."—R.]

[2] Ver. 26.—["Become vain-glorious" is both a more literal and a more correct rendering of γινώμεθα κενόδοξοι.—R.]

[3] VI. 1.—["Even if" preserves the force of καί.—R.]

[4] Ver. 2.—Ἀναπληρώσετε is strongly supported; and is to be preferred (with Lachmann and Schott) to the reading σατε; the latter was perhaps occasioned by the preceding imperatives. It is found however in ℵ., where, singularly enough, we have the moods reversed, βαστάσετε occuring in the preceding clause. ℵ[3]. however reads βαστάζετε. [The future, ἀναπληρώσετε, is the reading of ℵ[3], B. F. G., most versions; it is adopted by Meyer, De Wette, Mill, Ellicott, Lightfoot. The aorist imperative, σατε, is found in A. C. D. E. K., most cursives, Tischendorf (later eds.), Alford, Wordsworth. The aorist imperative is rare, and this is an argument in favor of retaining it. If it be retained, the E. V. is correct, with the other reading, it must be emended as above. The question is not easily settled, since the external authority is so nearly balanced.—R.]

[5] Ver. 4.—[Ellicott paraphrases as above. The E. V. is not satisfactory. See EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[6] Ver. 5.—["Load" is a good rendering. "Burden" is open to this great objection, that it does not discriminate between φορτίον and βάρη (ver. 2).—R.]

[7] Ver. 9.—['Εγκακῶμεν is the correct reading. ℵ. A. B. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth, Lightfoot. It is doubtful whether ἐκκακεῖν (Rec. ἐκκακῶμεν) is a genuine word.—R.]

[8] Ver. 10.—[Ἄρα οὖν, "accordingly then," see EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[9] Ver. 10.—Ἐργαζώμεθα. The reading ἐργαζόμεθα is too weakly supported. [So all modern Editors. Lachmann at first adopted the latter reading, but soon discarded it.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Paul, after the exhortation, ver. 13 (and the more general one, ver. 16), had passed on to a more didactic exposition. But from ver. 25 on, he returns to the general exhortation to "walk by the Spirit" (which, as he means it, is essentially equivalent to exercising serving love) immediately specifying it more particularly, ver. 26; vi. 1 sq.

Ver. 25. **If we live by the Spirit.**—*Ζῆν πνεύματι* means of course not the outward life, the realization in walk of this life in the Spirit, for the words "let us also walk," *etc.*, are the first in which the Apostle exhorts them to stamp

the life by the Spirit upon the outward walk. Ζῆν therefore means the inner life, and the spiritual life is here referred to, as one at first entirely internal. It is not improbable that "live" is to be taken here in a pregnant sense (MEYER)=if we are living through the Spirit, *i. e.*, death occurs to the man, who is Christ's, with respect to the "flesh;" but in another respect precisely thus does Life come in; the death of the old man introduces the life of the new (comp. ii. 19, 20), and this latter is grounded upon the "Spirit." [There is some doubt as to the force of the dative πνεύματι here. Schmoller renders it *durch den Geist;* MEYER calls it ablatival, and ELLICOTT says it is "here adopted rather than διά with the accusative as thus forming a sharper antithesis to the dative which follows." ALFORD follows the E. V., but, while objecting to the ablatival dative, gives the same sense to the word. LIGHTFOOT renders "to the Spirit," after the parallel passage, Rom. vi. 2, 10: "die unto sin," *etc.* But the first view is preferable.—R.]—**Let us also walk by the Spirit,**=περιπ. πν. ver. 16. [Schmoller thus makes the second πνεύματι an instrumental dative, but it seems better to take it as a normal dative (so ver. 16) with MEYER, ELLICOTT, *et al.* The verb στοιχεῖν seems to imply a more studied following of a prescribed course.—The Greek order is striking: "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit also let us walk." "By" has both the instrumental and normal force in English.—R.] In what this walk should consist is then shown.

Ver. 26. **Let us not become vain-glorious.**—The walking by the Spirit (or walking in love) should show itself thus. Κενόδοξον εἶναι= *vanam gloriam captare*, to affect vain-glory. [Γινώμεθα, "become" vain-glorious, there being in the verb as well as in the use of the first person an intentional *mildness* as though the sin had not yet taken root (ELLICOTT).—R.] The sense appears to be: we should not seek glory by provoking one another and envying one another, for such glory is "vain," worthless.—**Provoking one another.**—Ἀλλήλους προκαλούμενοι, by vaunting in the presence of those to whom we feel ourselves superior, by pressing our superiority.—**Envying one another.**—Ἀλλήλοις φθονοῦντες, not favoring one another, enviously refusing to acknowledge the good qualities that a man possesses. (Φθονεῖν is to be taken in this sense here, see below on vers. 6, 10.)—The seeking of vain-glory naturally goes hand in hand with provoking and envious behavior. Where the former is abandoned, the latter also disappears. The warning of this verse is nothing else than the admonition to serve one another by means of love (ver. 13), somewhat more particularly defined. The Apostle now reverts to this, in order to give it a more precise application. The remark on ver. 16, that the exhortation of the Apostle may have had a direct connection with the main theme of the Epistle, since the intrusion of the false teachers might very naturally have provoked a bitter party strife in the churches, applies also to the more special application of that admonition (ver. 13) in this section. Especially is it not improbable that through the intrusion of the false teachers the relation of the individual members to their teachers had been disturbed, thus giving occasion to the earnest admonition, vi. 6 sq. Yet this conjecture is not absolutely necessary; we need only suppose that some circumstances in the churches gave him particular occasion to direct his exhortation to this point.—[The context seems to justify the close connection of what follows with this verse. It is urged, however, that "brethren" indicates a change of topic (comp. iv. 12), and also that the change from the first to the second person favors the opinion that a new paragraph begins with vi. 1. But the thoughts are too closely linked, to allow these arguments from mere forms of expression to be conclusive against the close connection which MEYER and others defend.—R.]

VI. Vers. 1–5. These verses extend the warning of v. 26, against "provoking one another." The Christian instead of using any advantage he may possess over another, or any defect he may observe in him, to exalt himself above him (and thereby to provoke him), should, as walking by the Spirit, do just the reverse, should set his neighbor right, when he sees him at fault (ver. 1) and then help him bear the burdens which oppress him (ver. 2). Ver. 3 justifies these admonitions by the remark that a man's thinking himself to be something, when he is nothing, is self-cheatery; for it is such a vain imagining that underlies the refusal to set others right (in the spirit of meekness) and to carry their burdens. As the right means to be saved from this self-deception, Paul proceeds to commend self-examination. (On this, see below, vers. 4, 5.) [ELLICOTT thinks it probable "that the teachers are mainly addressed in vers. 1–6, and the hearers and laity in vers. 6–10." But while there are points in the exhortation specially applicable to classes thus distinguished, it seems best not to discriminate thus, for it limits the force of some parts of the exhortation, and might lead to an incorrect interpretation of ver. 1.—R.]

Ver. 1. [**Brethren.**—BEZA: a whole argument lies hidden under this one word.—R.]—**Even if a man be overtaken.**—Προληφθῇ: πρό expresses undoubtedly the unexpectedness of the being taken=before a man is aware, or is able to offer resistance. The ἐν shows that the verb is here to be understood as=to entangle, so that **in a fault**, according to the frequent Biblical image, is used of the snare in which any one is caught (WIESELER). LUTHER gives the sense quite correctly: "*übereilt*," overtaken. [The strictly temporal reference (before the arrival of the Epistle, or a recurrence of the offence) is unsatisfactory. ELLICOTT, ALFORD and LIGHTFOOT join καί with the verb: "if a man be even surprised," *i. e.*, caught before he can escape, *flagrante delicto;* thus implying an aggravation of the offence. But it is not necessary to connect καί thus, and such a meaning of the verb is rare, while the interpretation does not accord with the context so well as the common view given above. MEYER: The Apostle charitably regards the sins, which may occur among the Galatians, as *peccata precipitantiæ.*—R.]

Ye who are spiritual.—This refers back to ver. 25=ye who have the Holy Ghost, show your possession of it, your living by the Spirit, by such action. He thus describes "provoking one

another," as something repugnant to their very character. In view of this exalted predicate, which he ascribes to them, they should now reflect, what demeanor is the becoming one for them as "spiritual." This implies that they are not now conducting themselves agreeably to this designation, or such admonitions would be unnecessary. [The general character of the exhortation forbids our finding in this phrase a reference to a party of more liberal views, who had taken his side against the Judaizers, and were not paying sufficient regard to the weaker brethren. Hence there is no irony, but he is giving a test for their spirituality. It is true those who would stand the test, who were really led by the Spirit, would necessarily be the adherents of Paul, as the representative of the freedom of the gospel, but there is no evidence that there was such a party when he wrote.—R.]—But to the validity of this claim to be "spiritual," it is necessary that, when a brother is overtaken in a fault, the *πνευματικός* should **restore such a one**, should bring him into his normal state, instead of turning this fall into an occasion of self-exaltation against him. [Καταρτίζετε: the verb is properly a surgical term, applied to the setting of a joint, here used in an ethical sense, the idea of amendment being more prominent than that of punishment. The figurative meaning would perhaps imply some official act of restoration, but this is forbidden by the context.—R.] This "restoring" (or the wish for it) is the main idea, and not strictly speaking, as is commonly assumed, **the spirit of meekness**; or at least not this alone. This latter phrase only states the manner in which the setting right should be performed. This spirit must attend the act, or there is no real restoration, only a seeming one, in which the irritating lust of praise still seeks its gratification. It is forced, to understand "spirit" of the Holy Spirit, whose character is meekness, or rather who bestows meekness; it signifies the human spirit disposed to meekness. The foregoing "spiritual" does not require us to understand the Holy Spirit here, comp. 1 Cor. iv. 21. [It does not mean merely "a meek spirit," but a spirit whose characterizing quality is "meekness," with an ultimate reference to the Holy Spirit. (See ELLICOTT.) As "spiritual," possessing the Holy Spirit, their spirit toward offenders should be characterized by "meekness."—R.]—**Considering thyself.**—An individualizing transition to the singular. The added clause contains a motive to "restore" (not merely to "meekness").—**Lest thou also should be tempted**—and it happen to thee to be overtaken in a fault.

Ver. 2 makes the admonition of ver. 1 more general. It is not always by setting our neighbor right, that we may do him good; another exhibition of love is to bear his burdens.—**Burdens.**—Βάρη is undoubtedly in itself quite general: whatever presses our neighbor, lies heavy upon him, so that occasion is given to the vain-glorious man to provoke him. Moral delinquencies, such as are named in ver. 1, are included; but also more grievous things, such as outward distress.—**Bear.**—*Βαστάζετε*, of course, does not mean: endure (for I do not endure what oppresses my neighbor, but only that, for example, with which he oppresses me), but simply: bear=to take upon our shoulders as our own burdens, and thereby help him to bear; this includes, in some circumstances, the lightening of them; in others, their entire removal (WIESELER).—We see that the restoring of a neighbor who has been overtaken in a fault falls under this general idea of bearing his burden.—The Apostle adds to this admonition a powerful motive for its fulfilment: **and thus shall ye fulfil the law of Christ.**—The expression "fulfil the law of Christ" is significant, and designedly chosen with reference to the zealots for the law. You will forsooth have a law, now see here is a law but "of Christ;" fulfil that! At the same time it refers back to ver. 14, where the duty of love to our neighbor has been designated as the commandment equivalent to the whole Mosaic law, but a "law of Christ," not of Moses. [Yet this "law of Christ" must necessarily include that "law." which He not only came to fulfil, but so fully illustrated and enforced in His teachings. The use of the future indicative instead of the imperative seems to imply, that the Christian needs "the law of Christ" only as a guide to grateful duty. "Thus shall ye fulfil" what your hearts would fulfil, "the law of Christ," "who died for us and rose again."—R.]

Ver. 3. **For if a man think himself to be something, when he is nothing.**—"When he is nothing" belongs to the protasis. Being nothing: not precisely in the ethical sense alone, but one, who can in truth make no claim to consideration above others, yet ambitiously assumes this. This of course involves the admission that one may be something, but such a one is least likely to assume this; it is the one that is nothing, who is most likely to lay claim to consideration above his merits.—**He deceiveth himself,** his "glory" shows itself to be "vain," [LIGHTFOOT: "φρεναπατᾷ, 'deceives by his fancies.' Comp. Tit. i. 10. More is implied by this word than by ἀπατᾶν, for it brings out the idea of *subjective fancies* and thus enforces the previous δοκεῖ. It was possibly coined by St. Paul, for it seems not to be found in any earlier writer, and at a later date occurs chiefly, if not solely in ecclesiastical authors."—R.]

Ver. 4. Paul therefore immediately after enjoins: **let each man prove his own work.**—Τὸ ἔργον: not collective=the aggregate of his actions; for it is not particularly an ethical self-examination that is referred to, but general, about equivalent to: His case, the way matters stand with him. [The view of MEYER, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, *et al.*, that *τὸ ἔργον* is emphatic and collective, seems on the whole preferable.—R.]—The reason why he enjoins this, is then stated with: **then shall he have his ground of boasting only in what concerneth himself and not in what concerneth the other.**—"He will then have matter of self-gratulation only it will be in reference to himself, and not to another." [See the excellent note of ELLICOTT, the results of whose exegesis are given in the above rendering. The preposition εἰς must be translated by a paraphrasis, in order to preserve the same force in both cases. Τὸν ἕτερον, "the other"—the man with whom he was comparing himself; general in its meaning, but particular

in each case of comparison. (ALFORD.)—R.] Every one, in that case, directing his look as he does in self-examination only upon himself, will refer his self-praise only to himself; will only boast of such excellences as he may discover in himself; but he will not vaunt himself on the ground of the deficiencies which he finds in others. And if this results from the very *nature* of self-examination, as directing the look of the man upon himself alone, it will also be sure to come to pass from the result, which every one will find from self-examination, as this is stated in ver. 5, with which Paul gives special weight to the *οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἕτερον*. Of course not to the *εἰς ἑαυτόν*. In order to have *εἰς τὸν ἕτερον καύχημα*, *i. e.*, in order to be able to make what another lacks a ground for boasting over him, one must not only have many good qualities but a pre-eminence *above* the other, of which he is conscious.

Ver. 5. But this is not the case. On the contrary *ἕκαστος τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον βαστάσει*, **each man**: I as well as the other, I cannot therefore make his *φορτίον*, a ground of vaunting myself against him.—**Shall bear.**—Future, expressing the result of the self-examination, because it succeeds it (not referring to the last judgment) = it will turn out, that every one has a burden of his own to bear, [*i. e.*, now in actual life, he is appointed to bear, must bear.—R.]—**His own load.**—*Φορτίον*: although principally meaning moral imperfection, yet here it is not to be limited to this; it means imperfection of every kind, every defect which one discovers in himself. *Φορτίον* is in itself a *vox media*, it may be either heavy or light; *βάρος* can only be heavy. To this general declaration the more general word exactly suits; respecting the degree of burdensomeness Paul does not in the first instance mean to make a statement, but only to say that each one has his own *φορτίον*. It is otherwise in ver. 2: there the idea of heaviness is the main one. [CONYBEARE finds here an allusion to Æsop's fable (*πῆραι δύο*), but ELLICOTT thinks this not very plausible. LIGHTFOOT says: "*βάρη* suggests the idea of an adventitious and oppressive burden, which is not implied in *φορτίον*. The latter is the common term for a man's pack. Each Christian soldier bears his own kit." Still this does not sufficiently imply the idea of imperfection and consequent grievousness, which the context, with its injunctions to self-examination, seems to demand.—R.]—The difficulty in vers. 4 and 5 is, that the Apostle condenses together two thoughts: 1. "in what concerneth himself alone," 2. "not in what concerneth the other;" which to be sure are in one aspect identical, and yet must be distinguished, because the second is strengthened by the subsequent declaration, "for each man," *etc.*, which gives it a somewhat different sense from what it has when disjoined from this and taken with what precedes. DE WETTE takes it differently: And then will he have his joy (if he has any, which is manifestly put as doubtful) for himself alone (for his own joy) and not for others (to irritate and provoke them therewith).—Self-examination is therefore the antidote to "provoking one another;" it is to oppose this that the Apostle has enjoined it.

Vers. 6–10. This division also is a specifying of the admonition v. 26; it must, although more remotely related, still have reference to it, because it is undeniably a carrying out of the admonition to "serve one another by means of love," (v. 13,) of which, as we have seen, v. 26, only gives the negative expression. More accurately considered this division opposes the second vice named in v. 26, "envying one another." It contains admonitions to an abounding, unwearied "communication in good things," and this is the direct opposite of "envying one another"=grudgingly withholding. Only he who is unenvious will do good to all.

Ver. 6. The exhortation in this verse does not therefore come in so abruptly, as at first sight appears. Paul first opposes envious grudging in that relation in which it looks particularly ill, and yet must have occurred, in the relation of **him that is taught** in the word of God to **him that teacheth**, and in contrast with this, admonishes to **communicate** and that **in all good things**. This is of course not= in all that is morally good (MEYER), but = in all good things [*i. e.*, temporal possessions of every kind.—R.]. It is expressed with the utmost generalness, and is therefore to be understood in its broadest sense; care for temporal support is included in it, but not exclusively intended; there is to be, according to the words, a sharing of all good things, that is, in a certain sense a community of benefits; he "that is taught" is to give "him that teacheth" a share in all his advantages. This is the very strongest antithesis to "envying." [The verb means literally "go shares with." It is intransitive here, followed by the dative of the person, and the *thing* ("in all good things") governed by a preposition. There is no lexical or grammatical difficulty. Almost all commentators refer the verse to the temporal support of ministers. MEYER gives it an ethical meaning mainly to preserve the connection, and Schmoller, for the same reason, makes the meaning general, as above. But *δέ* arrests the former topic before it passes out of sight (LIGHTFOOT), and serves here to indicate the contrast between the temporal and spiritual application (ELLICOTT). As if he had said: "I spoke of bearing one another's burdens. There is one special application I would make of this rule. Provide for the temporal wants of your teachers in Christ." *Κατηχούμενος* here means simply "instructed," and is followed by an accusative of reference (*λόγον*), "in the word," *i. e.*, the gospel.—R.]

Vers. 7–10. To give weight to this admonition to him that is taught in the word that he should show a generous liberality in all things to his teacher, Paul points to the last judgment, to the law of Divine retribution as one of immutable validity. This is primarily meant to strengthen only the special admonition, ver. 6, and shows how earnestly he means it, that he attributes to it an importance which we may not in any way lessen; but still this confirmatory reference to Divine retribution is expressed with such generalness, that Paul is able immediately to deduce from it an entirely general exhortation to unwearied "well doing," which he then again specializes somewhat in ver. 10. But the main matter is still the "communicating in all good things" in opposition to "envying one another."

Ver. 7. **Be not deceived.**—Do not entertain the erroneous thought, even should it occur, or be presented to you, that **God** can be **mocked** (lit., to turn up the nose at), that is, with success. (All glory sought therein is vain.) This mocking would occur, if man might do what he would, if he could with impunity neglect a communication of good things to his teacher, who himself imparts that which is best to him. The declaration that this cannot occur, is established by **for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.***—[Τοῦτο καί; "this and nothing else than this" (ELLICOTT).—R.] The essential correspondence between the seed sown and the fruit reaped, which takes place according to a law of nature and is therefore subject to no mutation, is a current image in other writings also (even in profane writers, *e. g.* Cicero, *de Orat.* II. 65, *ut sementem faceris, ita metes*, and others), for the exact correspondence between the retribution of God in the judgment and the moral acts of man in his earthly life.

Ver. 8. The general proposition of ver. 7 is established in this verse. **For**, never will it fail of coming to pass, that **he that soweth to his own flesh shall** therefrom **reap corruption**; and even so **he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.**—"Corruption" is therefore conceived as that which corresponds to sowing to the flesh, as the harvest to the seed, or "corruption" is essentially the crop into which the flesh when sown develops, and in like manner "life everlasting" is nothing else than the ripened fruit sown to the Spirit.—Ὁ σπείρων, it may be remarked, does not alter the figure in ver. 7b, making it the soil instead of the seed, but, as Paul has to speak of two different sorts of seeds, he only designates this difference according to the difference of the soil, on which it is sown; for seed is always chosen according to the soil that is to be sown; that which is sown upon the flesh is even thereby a different seed from that which is sown upon the Spirit. Perhaps it would be better to say: ὅ in ver. 7 is not merely to be understood of the seed itself, but of the whole manner and method of the sowing, and so to be taken as equivalent to this: According as any one sows, even so shall he also reap; and in view of this "according as" we should have in ver. 8 to understand especially the soil which is sown, inasmuch as it is especially on this that the character of the harvest depends, as good or bad. For it is this that is treated of here. Flesh and Spirit, moreover, are figuratively represented as the soil, because they are conditioning, quickening factors, and therefore to sow upon the flesh or Spirit generically = to let one's self be determined in the act by the flesh or Spirit. Πνεῦμα of course, as in ver. 16 sq. = the Holy Ghost, and therefore lacks ἑαυτοῦ, which stands with σάρξ.† Φθορά, agreeably to the contrast with ζωὴ αἰώνιος = Destruction, Ruin, and that eternal ruin = ἀπώλεια, θάνατος, not = Transitoriness.—Ver. 8 was only a proof of ver. 7b, according to its two contrasted sides; 7b itself again was in proof of θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται. The sense of this is: One cannot neglect doing good, without being punished of God. But the thought is not expressed.

Ver. 9. Here, however, it is expressed affirmatively, agreeably to 8b. as an admonition (because it is true, as said in vers. 7 and 8, that what a man sows, he reaps) to do "well," in a certain sense to sow τὸ καλόν. That the admonition rests immediately upon what precedes, is shown by the continuance of the image, which we find at least in the second clause.—**Well doing** is to be taken in its greatest possible extension; agreeably to the signification of καλόν, about = to do what is praiseworthy, only it must not be taken so generally as no longer to fall within the sphere of unenvious exhibition of love towards our neighbor. This is the frame, within which this "well doing" also falls.—**Let us not be weary.**—["Behave cowardly, lose heart."—R.] It is possible to grow weary, because "well doing" is at first a sowing, which, according to the laws of nature, is not immediately, perhaps not till long after, followed by the harvest. It comes **in due season**, καιρῷ ἰδίῳ, not just when we wish it: at the precise time, when it can appear according to its inward law, as ordained by God. Agreeably to the eschatological expectations of the Apostle we have here to understand particularly the Parusia.—**If we faint not.**—Μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι, to be taken as conditional and to be referred to the sowing: if we do not become weary in that. This is no "languid repetition of the warning against ἐγκακεῖν" (USTERI); for it is just this not becoming weary in good which Paul wishes to emphasize, as the condition of reaping the harvest (WIESELER). [BENGEL: *ἐγκακεῖν est in velle, ἐκλύεσθαι est in posse.* The latter is a consequence of the former (LIGHTFOOT). The verse is one of mingled warning and encouragement, and the latter element appears from the promise to those who do not "faint," for one may be "weary," and not yet have fainted.—R.]

Ver. 10. [**Accordingly then as we have.**—Ἄρα οὖν, "so then," "accordingly then;" ὡς, not "while," nor "according as," nor since, but "in proportion as" (ALFORD).—R.] The mention of the "season" of the harvest reminds him to warn against wasting the καιρός, season, **opportunity**, of the sowing, because when the former is come, it will be too late for the latter. And in conclusion Paul deduces from the more general admonition (ver. 9) the more special exhortation **let us do good**, which is also to be taken in the widest possible extent, but still retaining the special idea of doing good. The generic interpretation of ἐργαζώμεθα τὸ ἀγαθόν = to do what is morally good (MEYER, as in ver. 6), is inconsistent especially with the distinction, which Paul makes with **especially**, *etc.* For to the doing of what is morally good, one is of course equally obliged towards *all* men, members of the household of faith or strangers to it (WIESELER).—**To them who are of the household of faith.**—Οἰκεῖοι τῆς πίστεως, doubt-

*[LIGHTFOOT calls attention to the fact that this proverb occurs in 2 Cor. ix. 6, in reference to the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem, to which object the Galatians had been asked to contribute (1 Cor. xvi. 1); he therefore conjectures that this implies a general censure of their habitual niggardliness.—R.]

†[Perhaps as LIGHTFOOT suggests to bring out the idea of selfishness. It need not be made emphatic, but is best retained in English by "to his own flesh."—R.]

less not merely=those belonging to faith, as an amplification of the simple term: Believers (MEYER), but kindred in faith, fellow-Christians, as constituting together one οἶκος τῆς πίστεως, one family of faith.* The emphasis rests upon the fact that believers are *of one family;* for this is the reason why love should be especially shown to them (WIESELER).—The expression is of course general and comprehends their fellow-Christians as a body, but yet it refers back to ver. 6; because their fellow-Christians should be so especially the objects of the "doing good," it follows from this, that those who teach should least of all be excluded therefrom. Paul in 1 Cor. xvi 1, 2, refers to a more specific instruction concerning beneficence which he had given to the Galatians.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Self-exaltation and self-seeking.* In respect to the right conduct of Christians towards each other, Paul designates two vices as especially incompatible therewith: Self-exaltation and self seeking. And indeed there is nothing which more undermines society in general than these two vices; while self-exaltation rends the inner bond of unity with our fellow-men, self-seeking rends besides this the outer bond. But now the maintaining of fellowship is the specific character of the relation of Christians to each other; they are meant to form an undivided whole. These two vices therefore stand in diametrical opposition to the very nature of the Christian life. And of course they must, for they are the immediate offspring of the "flesh," whose essence is self-seeking. But Christians should walk by the Spirit, and should prove this to each other especially by serving love.—Certain as it is therefore, that both self-exaltation and self-seeking stand opposed to the essence of Christian fellowship, and must therefore be most vigorously contended against, it is nevertheless equally certain, that they may, and do in fact, appear within the circle of Christian fellowship. For this is by no means as yet pure and free from such manifestations of the "flesh," though not thereby necessarily losing the name of Christian fellowship. On the contrary an individual or a community may really "have the Spirit," be possessed of a spiritual life, while yet in their walk the sarcical element still manifests itself in various ways, against which we must protest. Things must be rebuked which, looking at the ideal, and not at the concrete fact, might appear impossible to occur; admonitions must be given, which might from the ideal point of view appear superfluous. The admonitions given in this section are the simple proof of what was remarked on the former section, respecting the indispensableness of continual admonition, respecting the "shall" which the Spirit inwardly, as also the Word of Scripture from without, must continually present to the Christian. While therefore we must not be lax, as if every thing in the Christian life, including the fruits of the Spirit, came of itself, and while we must earnestly represent to the Christian the incongruity of every thing sarcical with his faith, we must on the other hand be very careful not to make rigoristic requirements of him, not to expect that no manifestation of the flesh should ever appear in him; we must not, in particular, imagine that among Christians every thing must, as it were, of itself, be serving love. And therefore, even when many virtues of the Christian life are yet very defective, we must not be quick to deny that one is "spiritual," to dispute the sincerity of his faith and declare him to be a hypocrite.

2. *Admonitions especially necessary for those busy about the law.* "But was it then necessary, one might here ask, that Paul should write such admonitions to people, who were already anxious about works of the law and out of conscience were submitting themselves to the Jewish ordinances? Was there not then in their case an exaggerated piety, that needed rather to be tempered? Alas, no! The world lies in wickedness and yet is busy about works of the law. It lives in contention and envy, in turbulence and lewdness, and yet forsooth will be saved by its virtue. By what sort of virtue? By a magnanimity, which from time to time, amid many evil deeds, a man may practice toward his neighbor, by wit and lively discourse, by a decent gravity, the offspring of age and function, of interest and love of honor, by the observance of political and ecclesiastical laws, yet with many exceptions. Let no one go into raptures over this virtue.—At a distance it appears great, but near by it is mean and in God's eyes naught. Do not such people need to have some one proclaim to them: Be not deceived, God is not mocked? The Galatians gave themselves up to the Jewish law, which did in fact contain the strictest moral teaching. They sought salvation earnestly, and sought it, not by vices, but by virtue and religious works; yet notwithstanding this Paul was constrained to warn them against all manner of gross sins, especially against hatred and envy, and to proclaim to them: Be not deceived, God is not mocked! How certain it is therefore, that he who does not live in faith on the Son of God, will be overmastered by sin, and in spite of his endeavors to be virtuous, will become ever more vicious! If then one does not come into the right way, he at last mocks God. And how does one mock Him? In this way, that one desperately imagines that He will at last take black for white, that He will let him reap wheat who has sown tares, and will reward the sin, to which men have given the name of a virtue. By such principles, which to be sure, when we read them on paper, contradict the first principles of human intelligence, the whole world is ruled, and therefore is there occasion to say it: God is not mocked; what a man sows in this world, that, and nothing else, shall he reap in the next." Roos.

3. *What a man sows, that shall he also reap.* An utterance as simple, as it is true and deep. According to it, all the actions of men are a sowing, which shall have a harvest, the actions of men shall bear a fruit. This image, taken from the processes of nature, declares in the first place in general terms, that actions never stop with themselves, but that with inexorable certainty

* [ALFORD and ELLICOTT deny this reference, but any other meaning seems insipid, and might have been better expressed in some other way.—R.]

a retribution will one day follow, as certainly as the sowing is only a beginning, which according to a settled law leads at last to the harvest. This it is true does not follow at once, and therefore there is need of patience, but afterwards, when the time has come, and then without fail. And, more definitely, the seed bears a harvest, and such a harvest as corresponds exactly with itself. The actions of men therefore find a retribution fully adequate. On this account it is not so indifferent what kind of seed we sow, for the seed, that is, our acts, will bear their proper fruit, and no other. If we want then a fruit to please us, we must sow a seed that will bring it; we shall never succeed in getting a harvest that is independent of the seed; and on the contrary no one can deprive us of the harvest that answers to the seed. The harvest of our actions is nothing casual, it is that which they must produce. It rests with us, then to determine the harvest, by determining the seed. If "corruption" is the harvest of sowing to the flesh, and "life everlasting" the harvest of sowing to the Spirit, each result follows by an inward necessity. The former is only the carnal sowing come to ripeness, the latter is only the ripened seed sown to the Spirit. Thereby the character of arbitrariness and externality is removed from the Divine retribution, and objections from this side obviated. But on the other hand it must not be thought, that we can in this way set aside the positive Divine activity, and therewith retribution in a definite sense, and change it into a kind of natural process. As in the natural process of the springing of the harvest from the seed, the inner law of nature, according to which this takes place, is no other than the law of God, as it is He who gives it effect, so is it also in this spiritual harvest. His ordinance is it, that "corruption" grows up from the sowing to the flesh and the reverse. And especially is this so, in that corruption is really what it is, only as decreed by Him, as consisting in being rejected by Him, and even so, on the contrary, life everlasting; this is His gift for the sowing to the spirit, only because He gives it and gives Himself also therein. Moreover the time of harvest is in itself simply a future one for the time of sowing; when the sowing, therefore, is over, every moment may be a "due season" for the harvest, even in this world, and there are indeed many such harvests. But these are only anticipations. The proper, due season for the harvest first comes with the time appointed by God for general retribution at the consummation of the kingdom of God. Not till then will the sowing to the flesh have ripened into corruption, and the sowing of the spirit into life everlasting. Before that, the time of the sowing still continues, and it is still possible to change the character of the harvest by changing the one sort of seed for the other.

4. *Care for spiritual teachers.* The emphasis and earnestness, with which Paul admonishes against a selfish behavior of the church towards her teachers, are remarkable. This very estimate of spiritual good, as above all others, makes him the more impatient of selfishness concealing itself behind a pretended spiritual mind. "The support of teachers by their hearers is grounded on a divine institution, not only in the Old Testament (comp. Priests and Levites), but also in the New. Although now in the New Testament there is no definite prescription how much of their property hearers shall contribute to their teachers, yet it is certain from the New Testament that God requires an adequate and liberal support. This admonition was the more necessary in the Apostle's time, because there were not then, as now, yearly incomes definitely appointed. But now that there are such settled incomes the admonition to hearers has not lost its force, especially when they know that the regular income is insufficient. Christ's commandment binds them then to a subsidy. Men act to-day, as if their forefathers alone had been bound to care for the support of their teachers, and the hearers of to-day had nothing to add to this." Starke.—Luther expresses himself very definitely and strongly respecting this duty towards teachers, *e. g.*: "It is indeed impossible that true Christians should endure to have their pastors pinched and in want. But because they do not only suffer this, but laugh in their sleeve at it, it is certain, that they are worse than Turks and Heathen."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 25. Heubner:—The internal and the external must harmonize, must be one. The outer life is the reflection and thereby the sign of the inward life.—Rieger:—To keep the flesh crucified is the only way to give room for the spirit, whose life appears in growing strength in a spiritual walk. Although walking is a consequence inseparable from life, yet the Apostle exhorts thereto, as to a duty, on account of the danger of slothfulness creeping on, as indeed one cannot walk without taking some special thought about it.—[Brown:—If we are spiritually alive, let us show that we are so by being spiritually active.—R.]

Ver. 26. Luther:—Love of vain glory is a common vice the whole world through, in all conditions. No village so small but there be one or two peasants therein, that will fain be taken for wiser and better than the rest. It is so pleasant to be pointed at with the finger and hear it said: See there is a man that is fit for anything! This vice is common, yet nowhere does it such harm, as to those who fulfil a spiritual function and service in the church.—[Calvin:—It is not lawful for us to glory but in God alone. Every other kind of glorying is pure vanity. Mutual provocations and envyings are the daughters of ambition.—R.]—Starke:—To seek honor with a proud spirit, is a token of a carnal man and an abomination to God. Lust of praise leads many sins together, held in one leash, as the huntsman leads hounds. Nothing is more opposite to the love of our neighbor, than high-minded self-love; wherefore it is of no use to commend the latter where the former is not eradicated.—Heubner:—The stoic pride of virtue also is the worst kind of vain-gloriousness.

Chap. VI. Ver. 1. Luther:—The forgiveness of sins belongs to those who are weak and frail in faith and life, and yet acknowledge their sins and pray for forgiveness; but to those who pervert the doctrine, it does not belong.—Rieger:—The very words, in which the Apostle

describes what behavior beseems us in regard to others' faults, are so chosen, that they insensibly incline us to the more merciful side. A *man* (how easy for a *man* to fall) is *overtaken* by the suddenness of temptation, by the concurrence of many circumstances, that have beclouded his vision. In such circumstances admonition, rebuke, persuasion, consolation, *etc.*, may do the work of *restoration*, even as a dislocated limb may be again set in place. But for this there is needed the *Spirit*, and therefore on the one hand not blind love, not a careless disparagement of the fault, and on the other hand not severity, but insight into the gospel, to draw from thence motives for forbearing admonition, such as shall advance the crucifixion of the flesh and the strengthening of the inward man.—HEDINGER:—Are we ourselves pure and blameless as angels, that our neighbor's fault drives us so quickly to arms? Was it Christ's way to break the bruised reed? Let us do as He did! The Lord is in the still small voice, although mighty winds sometimes herald his coming.—AUGUSTINE:—Rebuke administered in bitterness, profits not. *Quidquid lacerato animo dicetis, punientis est impetus, non caritas corrigentis; dilige et dic, quod voles.*—[CALVIN:—Nothing is more difficult than to bring us to examine or acknowledge our own weakness. Whatever may be our acuteness in detecting the faults of others, we do not see "the wallet that hangs behind our own back."—Whenever we have occasion to pronounce censure, let us begin with ourselves, and, remembering our own weakness, let us be indulgent to others.—R.]

Ver. 2. LUTHER:—A Christian must have strong shoulders and stout legs, in order to bear the flesh, *i. e.*, the weakness of his brethren; for they have vices that are troublesome and annoying. Therefore must love pass by and overlook, and endure much. We must learn, since we can so easily endure and overlook our own sins and faults, many of which we daily commit, to bear also other people's sin.—In STARKE:—What is our whole religion, but a burden-bearing? We have our own and also others' burden to bear. We are all on a journey; if one is like to give way, the other must refresh him; if one is likely to fall, the other must help him up.—If it is not to be answered for, that we should not help another bear his burden, how unchristian must it be, to double his burdens for him.—[WORDSWORTH:—Poverty is the load of some, and wealth is the load of others, perhaps the greater load of the two. It may weigh thee down to perdition. Bear the load of thy neighbor's poverty, and let him bear with thee the load of thy wealth. Thou lightenest thy load by lightening his.—R.]—[The law of Christ is the law of mutual love.—R.]

Ver. 3. STARKE:—Self-conceit and haughtiness have cheated many a man. Pride is the harbinger of a heavy fall. It is often a grace, when God allows the presumptuous one to fall, that he may come to a knowledge of his own nothingness.—[BROWN:—Those who in their own estimation have little to learn, have in truth learned but little.—The greater advances a man makes in true Christianity, the more humble he becomes.—R.]

Ver. 4. LUTHER:—He that faithfully discharges his function, does not inquire much what men say of him, it is all one to him, whether the world praises or reviles him, but he has his honor within himself, that is, the testimony of his conscience, and the honor before God. It will doubtless in time come to pass, that your honor, which you have within yourselves, will be acknowledged also by other people. But if you have your honor only from others, it will surely come to pass, that the shame and ignominy, which you have now inwardly concealed in your heart, will in time become manifest to other people also.—STARKE:—Daily self-examination is one of the most important of all the duties of a Christian. A Christian must always look more at himself than at others, and examine his own life more than another's; for God will judge each man according as He finds him to be in himself and before his own conscience.—RIEGER:—To seek one's glory by self-comparison with others, or even, it may be, by disparagement of others, by divulging their faults, is a perilous course, and will avail nothing, when hereafter each one shall have to give account of himself before God.

Ver. 5. HEUBNER:—Every genuine self-examination will certainly always have humiliation as its result.—[WORDSWORTH:—We cannot make the burdens of our own sins lighter by imputing a heavier burden of sins to others. Praise of ourselves, whether it proceeds from our own lips or those of others, cannot lighten our burdens. Because we are heavy laden, Christ exhorts us to take His light burden. Thus he converts our heavy burdens into light wings. The wings of birds are their weights, which they bear and which bear them. Let thy soul have the weight of Christ's burden; it has the pinions of peace and the wings of charity, and will bear thee to heaven, Thus bear thy own weight and it will bear thee.—R.]

Vers. 6-10. The more carefully one avoids judicial severity and other unwarranted assumptions in regard to others, the more room there is to make our intercourse with one another profitable for love and good works.

Ver 6. LUTHER:—I do not love to expound such sentences, which speak for us, that are ministers of the Word; moreover, it may look, if one is zealous to treat such texts before the people, as if he did it on account of avarice. But one must nevertheless instruct the people thereabout, that they may know what degree of honor and support they owe to their teachers. This is also good for us, that are in the ministry, to know, that we may not take our deserved recompense with uneasy conscience, and as if we had no right thereto.—RIEGER:—The Scripture has not accounted it superfluous, to put into His Word, that remains good for all time, the admonition to communicate in all good things with him who teaches. But it is to be left wholly to this same Spirit and His prompting, when he will bring the observance of this admonition so into effect, that it exercises faith and strengthens faith.—STARKE:—Between teachers and hearers there should be a lovely exchange and joyful barter. A hearer needs not to complain as though he suffered disadvantage in this exchange. Whoever will not give our Lord God a penny, gets his due, when he is forced to give the devil a dollar.—In general the world requites

the very greatest benefits bestowed upon it with the very basest unthankfulness.—[CALVIN:—It is one of the tricks of Satan to defraud godly ministers of support, that the church may be deprived of their services. Paul's recommendation arose from a desire to preserve a gospel ministry.—BROWN:—It had been well for the church and for the world, had Christianity been sustained and extended solely by the voluntary exertions and the voluntary contributions of those who themselves had experienced its invaluable blessings, and who felt the obligations under which both duty and gratitude laid them to supply the temporal wants of those who ministered to their spiritual necessities. Here, as in every other case, the foolishness of God is wiser than men.*—R.]

Ver. 7. In STARKE:—Mock on: God will endure it for awhile, and will not send a thunderbolt at once; yet will He not always be silent, but early enough will hold discourse with thee in wrath.—Whoever under any manner of apparent excuses seeks to deceive his neighbor, such an one mocks the omniscient God and does himself the greatest conceivable injury.—HEUBNER: —Besotted man would fain persuade himself that God's severity, His threatenings and judgments are not to be taken so very much in earnest. God is directly mocked when He is blasphemed, indirectly, when His commandments are presumptuously neglected.

Vers. 7, 8. In STARKE:—The realm of nature has many vestiges of Divine wisdom, goodness, righteousness in it, which show forth and reveal themselves yet more gloriously in the realm of grace.—It is undoubtedly agreeable to the Divine order, as in the realm of grace so in that of nature, that every one should enjoy what he himself sows or does, whether good or evil. But whoever does evil and yet hopes for good, opposes himself to God's order in vain, and his hope is lost.—The sowing to the flesh cannot possibly be followed by anything but an evil harvest, unless such a harvest before it ripen, be uprooted by true repentance.—Our whole life is nothing but a seed-time, with which the future harvest in eternity is inevitably connected. Ah! let every one take heed that he scatter not tares and yonder be compelled to reap the curse.—Corruption does not really come from God, either directly or indirectly, but from the flesh.—RIEGER:—How slight and insignificant good and evil often appear when first sown! But how steadily they grow day and night, unnoticed by man. How late, but how infallibly do they reappear at the harvest! How irrevocable is the neglected seed time! Who can force it into being an unsown harvest?—HEUBNER:—Future and present stand in the strictest connection. Our future state will not only follow our present, but will be in the very strictest sense its product; the two will stand in as real a nexus as the seed sown and the harvest.—There is a double seed-time and harvest! Sowing to the flesh does not consist merely in a gross carnality of life, such as is followed by the most wretched want and pain, but in all living and working, even that which, materially considered, is the most beneficent and laudable, when it proceeds from an impure motive. Sowing to the Spirit is not merely the spiritual vocation, but every sowing, which is done at the leading of the Spirit.—[CALVIN:—Our liberality is restrained by the supposition that whatever passes into the hands of another is lost to ourselves, and by the alarm we feel about our own prospects in life. These views Paul meets here.—BURKITT:—The Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead, will also raise us up at the great day, and reward our present parting with the things of this life which we cannot keep, with eternal life which we shall never lose.—R.]

Ver. 9. STARKE:—This admonition is uttered as an encouragement, as a way which has the least appearance of authority assumed over others. It is a way therefore which preachers should incline to use.—Christians may become weary in the race, for they find many an assault and many a hindrance. Happy are they who encourage themselves with this word: Let us not be weary in well doing! The more laborious the seedtime has been, the richer shall the harvest be. The harvest comes hereafter; the first fruits of the present time are a small matter compared with what is to come.—Christians are not greedy for reward, and do not demand it from God on the ground of merit, but they do suffer their work to be sweetened, and themselves spurred up to activity and faithfulness by the prospect of the reward.—[Fatigue is not weariness.—In well doing we are more apt to be weary than fatigued.—Weariness may come from habits of slothfulness.—The due season is God's season.—If we work on, feeling weary, yet not fainting, we shall reap.—R.]

Ver. 10. HEUBNER:—The incalculable value of the present life consists in this, that we have opportunity to do good. The fleshly minded cannot hereafter make up the good which he had the vocation and opportunity to do, *e. g.*, the hard hearted rich man, the negligent father or pastor, *etc.*—STARKE:—One should not put off remembering the poor till death. *Quod moriens das, ideo das, quod tecum ferre non potes; da igitur, dum vivis, et mercedem habebis.*—[BROWN:—The Christian knows no limits in doing good, except those which are fixed by his power and opportunity of doing good.—For a Christian to be unkind to a Christian is not only wrong, it is monstrous.—R.]—RIEGER:—As the house of God, the church, is of two kinds, the visible and the invisible, so are also those of the household of two kinds, namely, those who belong to the visible church, and then the true believers, whose faith and sincerity of heart are invisible. From this it follows, that one owes more love to his fellow-believers, even such as are so but in profession, than to those of another religion; but most to really believing fellow-members, to whom the appellation: they of the household of faith, especially applies. In the present day it is our business to seek out those who have pressed through from the service of the letter into the life of religion, into the service of the Spirit, and to count

* [The principle of *voluntaryism* so plainly implied in the verse has found its happiest exemplification in our own country. Dr. BROWN represents one of the few European churches (United Presbyterian Church of Scotland), that has not only acted upon, but stoutly contended for this principle.—R.]

them for the members of the household of faith chiefly commended to us.—SPENER:—The more closely one, besides the general bond, is connected with any one by a special bond also, the more is he under obligation towards such a one. Thus a man is bound to his wife, parents to their children, brothers and sisters and blood relatives to one another, masters to their servants, citizens of one town or dwellers in one house to each other, in respect to works of love, more than they are to others; yet always without prejudice to the general love of our neighbor.

On the whole Section:—Wherein Christians' walk in the Spirit should especially show itself in their conduct towards one another: (1) In this, that no one exalts himself above others, but that one helps another up when he falls and assists him to bear his burdens: (2) in this, that no one grudgingly withholds what is his from another, but willingly lets him share in all and is unwearied in doing good (especially towards those who impart to one the bread of life in the word of God).—SARWEY:—If ye live in the Spirit, then walk in the Spirit; if ye walk in the Spirit, then walk in humility and forbearance, and in thankfulness towards your teacher and in liberality towards your brethren; and if ye walk therein ye walk in blessing.—GLÖCKLER:—Concerning the spirituality of the children of God: (1) What people are in the word of God called spiritual; (2) what their duties are towards others and those of others towards them; (3) whether it is necessary for all that wish to be saved, to be be spiritual men; (4) how and when then one is to set about becoming a spiritual man. — HENGSTENBERG: — Christian love of neighbors as a chief part of a walk in the Spirit: it shows itself: (1) in loving converse with our neighbor, and that (*a*) in unambitious humility; (*b*) in helpful long-suffering; (*c*) in enduring patience; (2) in loving activity for our neighbor's good: (*a*) in willing advancement of church and school in our own dwelling place, see ver. 6; (*b*) in ready zeal for giving and helping for the sowing of the gospel in still wider circles (vers. 7, 8); (*c*) in general, in untiring doing of good of all kinds, especially to those of the household of faith (vers. 9, 10).

On vi. 1–5: Self-exaltation. (1) Wherein it shows itself. In this, that it does not do, what is mentioned in vers. 1 and 2. (2) What secures against it: Self-examination.

The single verses of the whole section almost all afford a theme at once, especially as several have the character of apothegms.

Ver. 25. Text and theme of a *Whitsunday sermon* in NITZSCH (*Auswahl* I. p. 177): — (1) The grounds of this Whitsuntide declaration. (*a*) The spiritual life requires to be demonstrated and revealed in the walk, or it does not exist; (*b*) it requires to be maintained and augmented by the walk or it is lost. (2) The substance of this requirement: not=abandon the world and kill the body; nor yet=no longer esteem the word and violate the law; but=in the power of the atonement pursue after holiness.

Ver. 2. Suitable text for a wedding discourse; vers. 7, 8, Fast-day, or New Year's eve, or harvest text; ver. 9, also a harvest text.

CONCLUSION OF THE EPISTLE.

Written by the Apostle with his own hand. He portrays himself in contrast with the False Teachers. An entreaty for future quiet out of regard to his sufferings. BENEDICTIONS.

CHAPTER VI. 11—18.

11 Ye see how large a letter I have written [See in how large letters I have written,
12 or with what letters I write] unto you with mine own hand. As many as desire to
make a fair shew in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest they
13 should [that they should not][2] suffer persecution for the cross of Christ. For neither they themselves [not even do they] who are circumcised[3] keep the law [themselves]; but desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh.
14 But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by
15 whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world[4]. For in Christ Jesus
[omit in Christ Jesus][5] neither circumcision availeth[6] anything, nor uncircumcision, but
16 a new creature. And as many as walk [shall walk][7] according to this rule, peace
17 *be* on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God. From [omit From] henceforth
let no man trouble me: for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord [omit the Lord][8]
18 Jesus. Brethren, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with your spirit [The
grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brethren]. Amen.

[1] Ver. 11.—[The E. V. is obviously incorrect both in rendering "ye see" and "how large a letter;" the two interpretations offered to our choice are given above. See EXEG. NOTES. The aorist ἔγραψα must be rendered: "I have written," if it is not an epistolary aorist; "I wrote" (Am. Bib. Un.) is verbally correct, but is not in any case a proper English dress for the Apostle's idea.—R.]

[2] Ver. 12.—[Μή is misplaced in Rec. after ἵνα. It should follow Χριστοῦ. Διώκωνται is the reading of ℵ B. D. E.

adopted by Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Meyer, Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Wordsworth. Tischendorf (with A. C. F. G. K. L.), διώκονται; an improbable solecism, arising from the frequent interchange of ω and ο.—R.]

[3] Ver. 13.—Rec. περιτεμνόμενοι; the reading περιτετμημένοι is, however, recommended by Griesbach, and adopted by Lachmann and Scholz. "With right; the perfect is absolutely necessary, since the Judaistic teachers are meant. The present was introduced by the transcribers, who had just written περιτέμνεσθαι and perhaps were reminded of ver. 3." Meyer. [If the perfect be the correct reading, we must render, "who have been circumcised," or simply "the circumcised;" but the present is not only *lectio difficilior*, but is supported by preponderant external authority (א. A. C. D. E. K., many versions); it is therefore adopted by Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Wordsworth.—R.]

[4] Ver. 14.—Τῷ is omitted by Lachmann on important authorities. [א. A. B. *etc.*; Alford, Lightfoot omit the article. There is great room for doubt, since the omission may be readily accounted for both by the similarity of the preceding syllable and the desire to conform with the anarthrous κόσμος; Meyer, Tischendorf, Ellicott, Wordsworth retain it.—A careful examination of all the proposed emendations leaves the impression that the rendering of this verse in the E. V. ought not to be altered in the least particular.—R.]

[5] Ver. 15.—Ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is probably an explanatory gloss from ver. 6, though א. has it. We should read simply: οὔτε—γάρ. [The MSS. authority for the longer reading is very great, but so many old versions follow the shorter one, and the probability of an importation from ver. 6 is so great, that Tischendorf and almost all editors adopt it.—R.]

[6] Ver. 15.—Ἐστίν; Elz. and Matth. [and Rec.] have ἰσχύει (from ver. 6) against decisive authorities.

[7] Ver. 16.—Στοιχήσουσιν. The reading στοιχοῦσιν is approved by Griesbach, put in the margin by Lachmann, and adopted by Tischendorf. Meyer asks with right: "What reason could the transcribers have had for changing it into the future?" [The authorities for the future are weighty; the change to the present is more explicable; the future is slightly more difficult. Adopted by Meyer, Alford, Lightfoot, Wordsworth; hence "shall walk."—R.]

[8] Ver. 17.—Κυρίου is omitted by Lachmann and Tischendorf, [Meyer, Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot, on the authority of A. B. C.—R.]; probably imported from ver. 18, but א. has τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. [Wordsworth, with his usual conservative tendencies, follows the Rec.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 11. **See with what letters I write [or in what large letters I have written** (see below)—R.] **unto you with mine own hand.**—Paul as a rule dictated his Epistles; but attested them by adding at least the conclusion in his own hand (comp. 2 Thess. iii. 17). So also in this Epistle. But as it is the first letter which he has written to the Galatians, he begs them to notice* his handwriting. This is the sense of πηλίκοις γράμμασιν, which is therefore simply = with what sort of letters. Ἔγραψα, according to the familiar epistolary usage; the aorist does not therefore refer back to the portion already written, but Paul means what he is just beginning to write in conclusion. So LAURENT, *zur Kritik der Briefe des Apostles Paulus*, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1864 H. 4, p. 643 sq.—His interpretation seems to have more in its favor than that of WIESELER (adopted in the 1st edition of this work), who renders it: "See with how great letters," *etc.*, referring the words to the whole Epistle, in this sense, that he means to give his readers a token of his special love in having written to them in quite large, and therefore unusually legible, characters, and that, not through an amanuensis, as ordinarily, but with his own hand. Against this LAURENT remarks: How is it conceivable that immediately after so profound and earnest a discourse, the Apostle should have reviewed the characters he had already written, and have made so trivial a remark about their appearance? Besides the letters were not at all large; not much larger than ours. In Paul's day cursive writing was already in use. While therefore the amanuensis probably wrote in uncial letters, Paul himself wrote cursively[!?]†—But his purpose in adding the conclusion with his own hand was in this case not merely to attest the Epistle. For the conclusion is unusually long. Paul was also impelled to write by the desire of impressing more deeply on the minds of the Galatians a notice respecting his own person in opposition to the false teachers.

[Two questions arise in the interpretation of this verse: 1. to what does the Apostle call attention; 2. to how much does he refer. The answer to the first question turns upon the meaning of πηλίκοις γράμμασιν, that to the second mainly, though not exclusively, upon the force of ἔγραψα. 1. We may determine with comparative certainty the meaning of πηλίκοις γράμμασιν. Πηλίκος, occurring only here and in Heb. vii. 3 (where the reference is to magnitude, though in an ethical sense), is not synonymous with πόσος, "how many;" hence "how many letters"=how large a letter, is incorrect: nor does the plural γράμματα mean "letter," for which Paul invariably uses ἐπιστολή. Besides the phrase γράφειν γράμμασιν, in the sense of "write a letter," is nowhere found. Nor is πηλίκος identical with ποῖος (so Schmoller and others), "what kind;" ELLICOTT justly characterizes this interpretation as arbitrary. It means "how large," referring to the size, implying that, for some cause, what Paul himself wrote was written in larger characters than usual (or perhaps than an amanuensis was in the habit of using). There is no necessity for finding a reference to shapelessness. It is no valid objection to say that this reference was trivial, for other things that Paul has written may be thus spoken of with equal propriety (comp. 2 Tim. iv. 13). See MEYER, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, WORDSWORTH and LIGHTFOOT. 2. To how much does he refer? In other words, did Paul write the whole Epistle with his own hand, or only these concluding verses. The aorist indicates the former, unless it be an epistolary aorist. But the burden of proof rests with those who maintain this. Besides if the reference be exclusively to what follows, it seems singular that the epistolary aorist should be chosen. We cannot perhaps decide the question from this word alone, but there are other considerations which may be urged in favor of the autographic character of the whole Epistle. *a*) Attention may have been called to the size of the letters, as a proof that Paul had written the whole, not using an amanuensis, who would probably have written more rapidly, hence in smaller characters, and this would be a proof of his earnestness and affection. *b*) The Epistle is largely a personal vindication, and hence was more likely to be an autograph. *c*) ALFORD

* ["Ἴδετε is imperative; "see" not "ye see" as E. V.—R.]

† [It does not appear whether this statement is made by Schmoller, on his own authority, or that of Laurent. There seems to be no other authority for it. The very reverse is more probable.—R.]

finds a similarity, in style and in use of words, between this and the Pastoral Epistles (which he regards as autographs), see Vol. III. *New Testament Prolegg.* pp. 4, 79 sq. *d*) WORDSWORTH refers to the passage in Habakkuk cited in this Epistle, (iii. 11), and finds in the injunction to the prophet to write "the just shall live by faith" in large characters, an implication that this Epistle on the same theme was written in similar characters. (This however is not of much weight.) Although the use of *ἔγραψα* is not decisive, yet taken in connection with the meaning of *πηλίκοις*, and whatever of weight attaches to the considerations mentioned above, it is much safer to assume that Paul wrote the whole letter; the probabilities are strongly in favor of this view. (So ALFORD, ELLICOTT and WORDSWORTH most decidedly.) There is a conjecture that the size or shapelessness of the letters arose from Paul's weakness of vision, but it must be regarded as only a conjecture. Comp. iv. 15. Paul could not have been unskilful in writing Greek.—R.]

Ver. 12. **As many as desire to make a fair shew in the flesh.**—In condensed sharp language the Apostle (vers. 12, 13) characterizes the intrigues of the false teachers. They are people who want to have a good repute (*εὐπροσωπῆσαι*), but for all that live in the flesh, according to the lusts of the flesh,* and shun suffering. Therefore **they constrain you to be circumcised.**—(*Ἀναγκάζουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι* = "are busied with forcing a circumcision upon you.") For this is done **only that they should not suffer persecution for the cross of Christ.**—*Τῷ σταυρῷ* not: on account of the cross, but: by the cross; the cross of Christ is itself represented as the persecutor—a significant image for these people's fear of the cross, because it brings persecution. But the cross of Christ brings with it such persecution, *sc.* on the part of the Jews, only when it is preached and confessed as the sole condition of salvation, which is not done when circumcision is regarded as a condition of salvation. Therefore they insist upon this, in order to escape persecution. [It seems better to take *τῷ σταυρῷ* as the dative of the *ground* or occasion (so MEYER, ALFORD, ELLICOTT and many others). Schmoller actually presents this view in his explanatory remark. It cannot mean "with the sufferings of the cross" (WINER). The objection to both is that "the cross of Christ" means "the atoning death of Christ upon the cross" (BROWN), and this meaning will not admit of these interpretations.—R.]

Ver. 13. Paul immediately explains the strong *μόνον*, "only" (ver. 12). They have in this no other view than the one assigned—the purely egoistic one—they are not concerned for the law on its own account; **for not even do they who are circumcised keep the law themselves.**—Of the circumcised, or those who receive circumcision, [the reference being to the Judaizing party; the perfect would perhaps point more to the leaders, the present to the party as one which was then enforcing this rite, —R.] with all their zeal for circumcision, it might be expected that they kept the law. But their conduct is hypocritical. When **they desire to have you circumcised**, it is not in the interest of the law, but only **that they may glory in your flesh**, that they may be able to boast themselves; and it is moreover the *σάρξ* of the Galatians, that is to be the subject of their boasting: to be taken either physically, with reference to the circumcision to be performed in their flesh; or in a sense similar to ver. 12, because if the Galatians should receive circumcision, they would follow the *σάρξ* and its suggestions, would display a carnal weakness and pliability of which these men would then boast as their own work. [The latter view is preferable.—R.]

Ver. 14. **But God forbid that I should glory.**—To this sinful boasting of the false teachers, to whom the cross of Christ is more or less a scandal, and who are unwilling to suffer any persecution for its sake, Paul opposes his own boasting, whose subject is this very cross of Christ. — **Save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.**—MEYER incorrectly supposes that Paul wishes to mention the subject of his official glorying over against the official vauntings of the false teachers, and hence understands "the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ" of the preaching of the cross of Christ, not of the fact itself. [In the 4th Ed. MEYER says: Only the cross of Christ should be the subject of his *καυχᾶσθαι*, *viz.*: that nothing other than the Redemption accomplished on the cross by Christ was the ground, contents and Divine assurance of his faith, life, hope, labor, *etc.*"—Surely this is not open to Schmoller's objection. — R.] WIESELER:—Paul will, in contrast with these Judaizers, not boast at all of what he is or has or does, and therefore also not of his official labors, but of the cross of Christ.—**By whom or which.**—*Δι' οὗ* is then most naturally referred to the main idea, "cross," not to "our Lord Jesus Christ." [The meaning is evidently the same, whether the relative be referred to one or the other; "by which" would mean through the cross of Christ; "by whom," through Christ crucified. Still there is much force in the suggestion, that the subject immediately preceding, "so fully and triumphantly expressed, so important and so emphasized, throws the other word into the shade." (It is not necessary to suppose that in this case we would find *ἐν ᾧ*.) Besides, the idea of sundered fellowship with the world, which follows, seems to imply here more of a fellowship with Christ than with the cross. See MEYER, ALFORD and ELLICOTT, and on the other side CALVIN, BENGEL, BROWN and LIGHTFOOT.—R.]

The world is crucified unto me.—By this Paul does not mean to state, for instance, why he cannot any longer boast of anything else, *viz.*, because nothing else exists for him (MEYER), but he gives in a few yet pregnant words a glimpse into the significance which the cross has for him, on account of its operation. It is of course only because the cross is for me the object of faith, because I stand by faith in inward fellowship therewith (comp. ii. 19), [or, better, with Christ Himself as the Crucified One—R.], that a crucifixion has been accomplished in my case also. Paul, however, is here speaking not simply of the fact that *he* or his old Ego has been crucified. Recognizing as he does his old Ego as one entangled with the world, and recognizing

* [Or perhaps, "make a fair shew in things which appertain to a mere fleshly life."—R.]

this entanglement with the world as its distinguishing character, he says, that the world, to which it clung, has been crucified to him, *i. e.*, the world had become in his eyes condemned, yea dead = had utterly lost all significance, all attractive power for him, and that therefore his fellowship with it had been wholly broken off. Of course Paul's fellowship of faith with the cross of Christ [or Christ crucified—R.] involved no direct action upon the world itself, but only upon it so far as it appertained to him, *i. e.*, upon his fellowship with it.—**And I to the world.**—And even so had he been crucified to the world. A crucifixion of him had naturally been the consequence of his fellowship of faith with the cross of Christ (comp. ii. 19), but calling to mind his former entanglement with the world, he declares himself crucified "to the world," says, that in its eyes also he is one dedicated to death, yea, a dead man, so that he has no longer any attraction for the world, that the world will have nothing more to do with him, that its fellowship with him is also fully dissolved. This double statement thus expresses in the strongest manner, the absolute dissolution of every bond between him and the world. To him this result appeared a gain, and he saw in this a new reason, for glorifying in the cross of Christ. The second clause, *κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ*, appears to imply also the positive statement, that not only does the world no longer regard him as one of its own, but also hates and persecutes him, and thus does precisely that which his adversaries seek to avoid (ver. 12); yet Paul accounts it as nothing. but glories in the cross of Christ, although it brings these consequences with it; so highly does he value the gain, which he has from it.

Ver. 15. **For.**—He immediately gives the reason for his determination to boast *exclusively* of the cross of Christ (not for the *δι' οὗ*, MEYER).—**Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.**—Everything depends on the last, nothing on the first. But it is the cross of Christ which leads to this new creation, and that through the operation of it described by *δι' οὗ* in ver. 14. This reciprocal crucifixion of the world and the old man to each other is the death of the old man and the beginning of a new one. [*Καινὴ κτίσις* is probably passive, the thing created, resulting from a new creation on the part of God.—R]

Ver. 16. **And as many as shall walk according to this rule.**—In ver. 15 Paul stated a principle; here he designates this as the standard, according to which one should walk. Upon all who shall thus walk (the future applies to the time from the receipt of the Epistle thenceforward; Paul hopes that the Epistle will have a converting and confirming effect upon the readers) he invokes **peace*** (see on i. 3) and **mercy**, thereby indicating the high importance of this standard. As this belongs to the conclusion, it is best to take it as a benediction: others understand it as a statement, supplying *ἔσται*.—The correct interpretation of **and upon the Israel of God** is the explicative one = that is [for they are the Israel of God.—R.] For there is here no reason for bringing the Jewish Christians into especial prominence; besides, the comprehensive *ὅσοι* does not admit of a national distinction being now first made in addition, and others named, who, it would even appear, had not to walk according to this standard. On the other hand, "the designation of all those, who walk according to this Anti-Judaistic standard, as the Israel of God, the true theocratic people, at this solemn close, is, as it were, the triumph of the whole Epistle."—MEYER. [ELLICOTT doubts whether *καί* can have so strong an explicative force, and prefers to take it as copulative, as if the Apostle's thought turned to his kindred according to the flesh; but the exegetical objections to this view are great, and the other interpretation is so suitable that it must be adopted.—R.]

Ver. 17. **Henceforth let no man trouble me**, *i. e.*, by still listening to the false teachers; **for I** (*ἐγώ* and not the persecution-shunning false teachers) **bear in my body the marks of Jesus**, the stigmata of Jesus, *i. e.*, the proofs, that I am a real servant of Jesus (*στίγματα* with reference to the marks which masters had branded upon their slaves), namely, in all the traces, scars, wounds, and the like, of the maltreatments and persecutions, which I have endured in my apostolic calling. ["Of Jesus," *i. e.* my Master, Captain, God, for slaves, soldiers and votaries bore such marks. See WORDSWORTH and LIGHTFOOT *in loco*.—R.]

Ver. 18. **The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit.**—*Μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν*; we are not to understand a special intention in his not writing the simple *μεθ' ὑμῶν*; yet we should not overlook what is significant in the expression. Grace operates and is meant to operate upon the *πνεῦμα* of the man; only so does it operate truly and fully, and just such a full, truly salutary operation of grace does he wish for them.—**Brethren**.—*Ἀδελφοί*: "The Epistle, so severe in its prevailing tone, concludes with this address, in which unaltered brotherly love expresses itself." MEYER. [BENGEL: *Ita mollitur totius epistolæ severitas.*—R.]—**Amen.**

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

Christ's cross is the touchstone of true Christianity. What Paul says in this section of the Judaistic teachers, applies strikingly *mutatis mutandis*, to the great mass of nominal Christians.* They by no means wish to keep the law in its whole extent, that is much too burdensome for them; on the contrary they appeal to the fact that they forsooth believe on Christ, and therefore are free from the yoke of the law. But now on the other hand they have as little mind to believe on Christ in the whole extent of faith; what is inconvenient in this, they leave behind, and that is the cross of Christ, *i. e.*, so far as it is a means of quieting the conscience, it is willingly accepted, but so far as it includes a dying of the old man, and the entering into a fellowship of the cross with Christ, they will none of it. Instead of this men turn rather to the otherwise despised law, and arbitrarily make the law to consist in this or that particular, some practice, some abstinence.

* [WORDSWORTH remarks that this is the only place in the New Testament where *εἰρήνη* is placed before *ἔλεος*.—R.]

* [True where this commentary was written, but partially true everywhere.—R.]

and imagine themselves there to be satisfying all the severer requirements of God, while yet they are far from this utterance: The world is crucified to me and I unto the world!—Christ's cross is the touchstone of true Christianity; it is in this, that salvation and comfort is to be sought, and so far it would not be so very hard to glory in the cross of Christ, which many are willing to do. But salvation and consolation are to be sought exclusively in that, no longer in the world, no longer in one's self, everything else is to be accounted loss, and on the other hand the fellowship with the cross of Christ is to be counted no loss; in brief, there must come into being a new creature. This is the "Canon" (ver. 16) for a Christian; only he who guides himself according to this becomes and is in truth a Christian. This is hard and yet not impossible. God will help therein by the pedagogy of his law, and will lead to faith, and to faith will give the Spirit, which helps through to the new creature.—Comp. also Roos: "Paul shows, that it is not so completely indifferent, what a man thinks of Christ and His cross. Now-a-days, as many of the people say: I pray, read, hear, and am none of the worst. A clever man of the world says: I do much evil, but I have a good heart with it all, and between my evil works I also do some good ones. God will look at me on my good side. What now shall we make of Jesus of Nazareth? Here the world boggles. At last it says: Let Him pass for a good teacher, who has told us, that God is not the God of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles, and that He loves such virtuous persons as we. Let Him be also an example for imitation. Finally, let Him be also, if one will so have it, the Redeemer, who has acquired for us freedom to hasten on a broad and easy way, with a trifle of virtue, light-mindedly to eternity, and notwithstanding our wickedness to fear no punishment. Now consider, whether this is the gospel of Paul, and whether he so preached Christ. Can such a man say that he boasts only of the cross of Christ, and that through it the world is crucified to him and he unto the world? Has he experienced a new creation? Is the culture, which age, office, intercourse with men, has given him, worthy of this lofty name? Is he in Christ Jesus? Has he the confidence, as he is, to stand before the holy God? Let him, in moments of reflection, put this question to himself and hear concerning it the answer of God and the Bible. Perhaps God will be so gracious as yet to reveal to him the gospel which Paul preached, and if this is so, he will be astonished to find that before this, he, without his knowledge, had a false religion. Mercy and peace be upon every one that is thus brought right."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 12. Rieger:—In every age there are points in which the world insists upon being yielded to, agreeing then to leave other points untouched. And whoever does not consent to this impure commingling, must not only suffer persecution, but also bear the reproach, that he himself is to blame, that he suffers only on account of his own self-will.—Hedinger:—How many thousand brethren have ye, ye clerical placemen, in Galatia? The handful of barley, the merry countenance, the assured friendliness, the favorable patron your comfort; flattery and trimming the sails, you think, will bring a man on. I do not agree with you. Moses' course and choice is the best. Christ's reproach before the purple of Egypt.—Starke:—Love must, indeed, cover and excuse a neighbor's faults, but from hypocrites and seducers one must, for a warning, tear away the mask; especially should those do it to whose office it appertains.—Spener:—The doctrine of Christ preaches Christ's cross, and brings a cross to him who preaches it.

Ver. 13. Hedinger:—To preach to others and be one's self a reprobate, to lade others with burdens, and not one's self to touch them with a finger, what hypocrisy!—Starke:—It is an attribute of false teachers and zealots for religion, who are only concerned with the outside, to proselytize a man to the religion, let him believe afterwards as he will. This is a carnal zeal with abundant craving for notoriety.

Ver. 14. In Starke:—Christians must not be ashamed of the cross of Christ, but rather glory in being justified and saved by that alone. Faith in Christ, the Crucified One, brings commonly such a fellowship of suffering with Him, that one has to bear his cross after the Lord Christ.—As soon as the union of a soul with Christ through faith takes place, so soon is the tie which holds it to the sin prevailing in the world, loosed.—A Christian may have much which even the world esteems, but the heart must not rest upon it.—Luther:—The world is crucified to me, *i. e.*, I account, that the world is damned; and even so am I in turn crucified unto the world, *i. e.*, it accounts, that I am damned. Thus we condemn one another. I anathematize all its human righteousness, doctrine, and work, as the very devil's poison, and it in return anathematizes also my doctrine and work, counts me for a mischievous man, *etc.*

Ver. 15. Luther:—"A new creature" does not mean, that one clothes himself differently, and puts on a different air, from before, but it means the renewal of the mind, which is brought about by the Holy Ghost. From that there follows an alteration of the outer life. For where the heart through the gospel obtains a new light, there it never fails that the outward senses also are altered. The ears have there no longer pleasure, in hearing human dreams and fools' tidings, but God's word alone. The mouth no longer boasts of a man's own works, righteousness and monastic rule, but of God's compassion in Christ Jesus. This then is an alteration, which consists not in words, but in work and in power.

Ver. 16. [Burkitt:—1. Christianity is a walk: a free and voluntary motion, an uniform and even motion, a progressive motion, a constant motion. 2. This walk is a walk by rule. A Christian is not a lawless person to range up and down as fancy leads him. 3. The rule is the law of the new creature. The new creature, in the principles and workings of it, is made the ground, the pattern and direction of our obedience, and we frame and square all the actions of our lives according thereunto. 4. The blessed privileges belonging to those who thus walk:

peace and mercy. 5. Such are the true Israel: a thousand times greater privilege than to be the children of Abraham's flesh.—R.]—RIEGER:—Even if one cannot accept the ungodly peace offered by those who make a fair show in the flesh, yet one by steadfast abiding within the limits of his faith, has the enjoyment of a Divine peace, and mercy is shown us in recompense of what many a one will lay upon us with an unrighteous judgment.

Ver. 17. In STARKE:—The burdened servant of the Lord has a claim to be unmolested.—It is not necessary to be ever anew entering into argument with unprofitable chatterers in defence of the truth, especially where it has been once and again vindicated against them.—LUTHER:—Because I am Christ's servant and walk after the right rule, *i. e.*, because I publicly confess, that out of Christ no man can attain to salvation, therefore also must I wear my Lord's livery, which does not consist in marks and scars that I have inflicted in will worship as presumption on myself, like Francis, but such as are without my thanks or will inflicted on me by the world and Satan for Jesus' sake.

Ver. 18. In STARKE:—Grace is the beginning, middle and end in Paul's writings. As the beginning of religion is grace, so does its progress depend upon grace. Dost thou, O Christian, in thy solicitations from men, find neither grace nor comfort? Be not dismayed! The grace of thy Lord Jesus remains assured to thee.—Let every one see to it, that he be and remain a dear brother of Paul, *i. e.*, a true child of God; so may he also appropriate to himself the wish that God's grace may remain with him, with a believing Amen.—[BROWN:—Thus does the Apostle conclude this admirable Epistle, and show us, by his example, what it is to do all things in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father by him.—R.]

Fleeing the cross, or boasting of the cross? The decisive question in religion.—In LISCO:—The incomparable worthiness of the cross of Christ to be gloried in: 1. That a man can only refuse to acknowledge this out of unworthy motives. a) That such a refusal exists; b) why many refuse: *α*) because one will only make a fair show in the flesh, *β*) because one is not willing to be persecuted with the cross of Christ, *γ*) because one will have glorying for himself and by means of himself. 2. On what account the cross of Christ is thus solely worthy to be gloried in: a) for the sake of that, which came to pass thereon; b) for the sake of the fruit which the cross of Christ bears in the hearts and lives of His people: *α*) as respects their demeanor toward the world, *β*) as respects their temper towards others: they cherish warm love towards those of like mind; they contemn the assaults of those, that are not so minded; they wish that all may become and remain sharers in His grace.

[The Apostle had first vindicated *his* apostleship, then *his* gospel, but was it for his own glory? Nay, in one sense ver. 14 is a summing up of the whole Epistle; all this defence, this earnestness, this boldness, this tenderness, was but a glorying in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.—Many see the cross, some trust in it, not all of these glory in it. Why not? Because their fellowship with Christ is not yet such, that the world is crucified to them and they to the world.—Those who gloried in the cross of Christ have gotten glory to Christ and His cross.—Among the many celebrated sermons on ver. 14 may be mentioned those of Bishops ATTERBURY and BEVERIDGE, also of MCLAURIN, SUMMERFIELD and MCCHEYNE.—R.]

THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

EPHESIANS.

BY

KARL BRAUNE, D.D.

GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT AT ALTENBURG, SAXONY.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, WITH ADDITIONS,

BY

M. B. RIDDLE, D.D.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,
743 AND 745 BROADWAY.

THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE EPHESIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

1. SYNOPSIS.*

ADDRESS AND SALUTATION (I. 1, 2).

PART FIRST:

The Glory of the Church of Christ (I. 3—III. 21).

A. THE GROUND AND GOAL OF THE CHURCH (I. 3–23).

a. *Grateful praise of the decree of grace* (i. 3–14). After the opening verse (ver. 3) the triple foundation of the praise, through the election of eternal mercy (vers. 4–6), the carrying out of the eternal election (vers. 7–12), the personal appropriation of salvation (vers. 13, 14).

b. *Exhortation springing out of the Apostle's supplication for the Church as the Body of Christ, who is the Head* (i. 15–23). With *thanksgiving* for the reader's faith and love (vers. 15, 16) there is joined the *petition*, that God would make known to them the glory of their calling and inheritance as well as of His power (vers. 17–19), which glory is manifest, actual and efficient in the exaltation of Christ over all as Head of the Church, that as His Body is the fulness of Him who filleth all in all (vers. 20–23).

B. THE EXTENT AND MISSION OF THE CHURCH.

a. *Reminder of the previous condition of death and the glorious new creation* (ii. 1-10). From the Resurrection and Exaltation of Christ the Apostle arrives first at the thought of the similar condition of death in the case of the Gentiles (vers. 1, 2) and the Jews (ver. 3), and then of God's mercy, which has quickened and blessed these miserable ones in, with and through Christ (vers. 4-7), of grace through faith (vers. 8, 9), as new creatures in Christ (ver. 10).

b. *Extolling comparison of the previous and the present condition* (ii. 11-22). After a detailed description of the previous condition without Christ, promise and God (vers. 11, 12), Paul sets forth the fundamental trait of the present status as nearness to God (ver. 13), explaining the nature and origin of the same in and through the Person and sufferings of Christ (vers. 14-18);

* [A popular summary is: I. The *doctrinal* part (chaps. I.—III.): The Church is chosen, redeemed, united *in Christ*. II. The *practical* part (chaps. IV.—VI.): *Therefore* let the Church walk in unity, in newness of life as regards personal and relative duties, in the strength of the Lord and the armor of God.—The reader is referred to the able Synopsis of Dr. LANGE in the *general Introduction* to the Pauline Epistles, Romans, pp. 15, 22. In accordance with his view of the twofold theme in each Epistle, he finds the fundamental theme of this Epistle in chap. i. 20–23, the final theme in chap. iv. 1–6.—R.]

sketching the present condition as that of citizens in the kingdom of God, members in His family, as built into the temple and house of God (vers. 19-22).

C. THE OFFICE AND SERVICE OF THE CHURCH (III. 1–21).

a. *The office in and for this church* (iii. 1-13). In spite of bonds (ver. 1) it is an office of that grace (ver. 2), in which God has made known the mystery of Christ (ver. 4), now made manifest (ver. 5): The acceptance of all nations into the kingdom of God through the Gospel (vers. 6, 7); to the humble minister the riches of Christ are entrusted (ver. 8), that thus on earth and in heaven the wisdom of God might be manifested in the Church (vers. 9, 10), according to God's eternal purpose (ver. 11), and that we might be comforted (ver. 12, 13).

b. *The Apostle's petition with an exhortation for the church* (iii. 14–19). Addressed to the Father (vers. 14, 15), it respects strengthening in the inner man (ver. 16), and Christ's dwelling in the heart through faith, in love (vers. 17, 18 *a*) unto the comprehension of love (vers. 18 *b*, 19).

c. *Conclusion in the form of a Doxology* (iii. 20, 21), praising the might of the merciful God (ver. 20), who makes the church in Christ glorious unto eternity (ver. 21).

PART SECOND:

The Spirit ruling in the Church of Christ (IV. 1—VI. 20).

A. THEME OF THE WHOLE PART (iv. 1-3): Walk worthy of the calling in love and unity.

B. THREE MOTIVES to the preservation of the unity in the Spirit (iv. 4-6).

a. The working of the Triune God in the church (iv. 4-6);

b. The gift of Christ to individuals (iv. 7-10): Each one is cared for (ver. 7), Christ has the requisite power (vers. 8, 10): He came from heaven and is exalted thither again;

c. The organization and organism of the church (iv. 11-16): The immediate end of the different offices (ver. 11) is the edification of the church (ver. 12), the ultimate aim is likeness to Christ (ver. 13), the operation depends on independence and growth through genuineness in love to Christ (vers. 14, 15), from whom as Head, the Body, richly furnished with members, knit together, grows in the reciprocal service of love (ver. 16).

C. GENERAL CHRISTIAN DUTIES (iv. 17—v. 21).

a. *Principle of the new walk with reference to the antithesis of the old and the new man* (iv. 17-24): The conduct of the heathen is a type of the natural conduct in general (vers. 17-19); after a reminder respecting Christ and Christian instruction (vers. 20, 21), he speaks of Christian conduct in its putting off the old man and putting on the new in deeply inward renewal (vers. 22-24).

b. *Special traits of the new walk* (iv. 25-32). The general basis is: no lie, but truth (ver. 25), the particular points refer to temper, disposition. Anger without sin (vers. 26, 27); as respects act, honesty even to beneficence (ver. 28); as respects speech, no corrupt word, but gracious speech unto edification (vers. 29, 30). The comprehensive conclusion (vers. 31, 32) refers to the evil that must be removed, and to the forgiving love that should exist in the church.

c. *Three points of view for the new walk* (v. 1-14):

(1) Look *above* thyself to follow God (vers. 1, 2)!

(2) Look *into* thyself and think of purity (vers. 3-5)!

(3) Look *about* thyself and be independent as respects evil men and deeds, and be benevolent (vers. 6-14).

d. *Exhortation to a walk with careful consideration of the Christian position* (v. 15-21): Wise carefulness, zealously using the time, precisely the evil time (vers. 15, 16), clear as to the will of God (ver. 17), avoiding drunkenness (ver. 18), but inspiriting with social song, with private melody, continued thankfulness, and mutual submission (vers. 19-21).

D. SPECIAL CHRISTIAN DUTIES *in domestic relations* (v. 22—vi. 9):

a. *Wives and husbands* (v. 22-33), to which is added a comparison with the church and Christ, in order to enjoin love upon the husbands and submission upon the wives;
b. *Children and parents* (vi. 1-4): the former should honor and obey; the latter should in self-discipline train and admonish them for the Lord;
c. *Servants and masters* (vi. 5-9): the former should obey as the servants of Christ, in hope on Him, and the latter should deal with them without threatening.

E. CONCLUDING EXHORTATION (vi. 10-20) to be strong in the Lord (ver. 10), to contend in the armor of God, needed on account of the adversary the devil (vers. 11-13), but sufficient with its particular pieces (vers. 14-17), if prayer and supplication be added (vers. 18-20).

CLOSE OF THE EPISTLE (VI. 21-24).

A. *Personal Intelligence* respecting Paul and those with him is carried by the bearer of the letter (vers. 21, 22).

B. *Two-fold salutation* (vers. 23, 24): Peace and Love with Faith in and among the members of the church—and grace upon and with them.

2. FUNDAMENTAL THOUGHT.

STIER is undoubtedly correct in taking "*the church which is in Christ Jesus*" as the fundamental thought of the Epistle; his plan, however, on account of its trinitarian division, based on ground, course and aim, in each larger and smaller group, is rather artificial than masterly. The church of Christ has its root in eternity, in God's fatherly heart with its thoughts of peace toward a wicked yet beloved world, and lifts its head into eternity again by the throne of God, ramifying into all the institutions given in creation, even the most special, through all the centuries of developing history, and *all this in Christ*.

Such being the contents, it will not suffice to find in the Epistle only the carrying out of the simple grand thought, that God according to His gracious decree formed from eternity in Christ, has called *the Gentiles* out of the deepest darkness into His light and into fellowship with His ancient covenant people (VON GERLACH). [So HODGE substantially.] Still less is the main matter of the Epistle to be sought in *opposition to the prejudice* of the Jews, who did not wish to admit the Gentiles into the church (*Berlenburger Bible*).

[STIER's view is adopted in the main by ALFORD, who accepts the threefold division in all the parts of the Epistle. "But in fact the *trichotomy* respecting the church rests upon another and sublimer yet. Everywhere with him the origin and foundation of the church is in the *will of the Father*, τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ,—the work and course of the church is by *the satisfaction of the* Son, by our υἱοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,—the scope and end of the church is the *life in the Holy Spirit*,—*δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον*."—R.]

§ 2. THE CHARACTER OF THE EPISTLE.

1. The *language and tone* of the Epistle, as is obvious in the first part (i. 3, 15, 16; iii. 1, 13 ff.), are essentially governed by the fact, that we have here no scientific exposition nor even a dialectic development, but the thoughts roused in the praying soul of the Apostle are uttered in the continuing emotion. The thought did not then appear gradually in its parts and divisions, but as is the rule in contemplation, in its integrity and fulness. The language accordingly has difficulty in compassing the thought, struggling in a fulness and flow of words, in linked sentences, with the presentation of an idea that transcends it, as the first part repeatedly shows us. —Besides it is evident that the church was gathered mainly from among the Gentiles (ii. 1, 2; iii. 11-13; iv. 17-22), and the writer, as the Apostle to the Gentiles, confronts them in the full joyous consciousness of his office (iii. 1, 7, 8).

[BISHOP ELLICOTT, the most grammatical of English commentators, says that "in this Epistle the cases, *especially the genitive*, present almost every phase and form of difficulty; the uses are most various, the combinations most subtle and significant." While the use of particles is simple, "the intertexture of sentences, and the connection of clauses, especially in the earlier por-

tions of the Epistle, try the powers and principles of grammatical and logical analysis to the very uttermost.—In the first chapter more particularly, when we are permitted as it were to gaze upon the evolution of the archetypal dispensation of God, amidst those linked and blended clauses that, like the enwreathed smoke of some sweet-smelling sacrifice, mount and mount upwards to the very heaven of heavens, in that group of sentences of rarest harmony, and more than mortal eloquence, these difficulties are so great and so deep, that the most exact language and the most discriminating analysis seem, as they truly are, too poor and too weak to convey the force or connection of expressions so august, and thoughts so unspeakably profound."—So DEAN ALFORD (Vol. III., *Prolegg.* pp. 24, 25): "These characteristics contribute to make our Epistle *by far the most difficult of all the writings of St. Paul.* All on the surface is smooth, and flows on unquestioned by the untheological reader: but when we begin to inquire, why thought succeeds to thought, and one cumbrous parenthesis to another,—depths under depths disclose themselves, wonderful systems of parallel allusion, frequent and complicated underplots; every word, the more we search, approves itself as set in its exact logical place; we see every phrase contributing, by its own similar organization and articulation, to the carrying out of the organic whole. But this result is not won without much labor of thought,—without repeated and minute laying together of portions and expressions,—without bestowing on single words and phrases, and their succession and arrangement, as much study as would suffice for whole sections of the more exoteric Epistles."—R.]

2. What is wanting in no other *Pauline* Epistle will be missed most of all in the Epistle to the Ephesians, *viz.*, historical references. Only two facts are noticed: the *imprisonment* (iii. 1; iv. 1; vi. 20) and the sending of Tychicus with oral intelligence (vi. 21, 22). This omission in view of the lively interest the writer takes in the church, and desires on the part of the church (i. 15-18; iii. 1, 13-19; vi. 10, 19-22), is all the more remarkable, since he had labored with great zeal in Ephesus for nearly three years (Acts xx. 18, 19, 31) and, on taking leave of the elders of the church in the summer of A. D. 58 or 59, had referred to false teachers about to arise (Acts xx. 29, 30). Of this we find no trace here. No member of the church is saluted either by the Apostle or his companions. Not the slightest hint is given of any false doctrine. For iii. 4 does not refer to opponents attacking his apostolic authority, while iv. 15, 16, relates only to general experience, and v. 6, to moral temptations, not to any particular false teachers.

3. The Epistle is distinguished by its Universalism. This will appear most strikingly from a comparison with the Epistle to the Colossians; other characteristics will thus also become unmistakably evident.

EPH.	COL.	EPH.	COL.	EPH.	COL.
i. 1, 2.	i. 1, 2.	iii. 1-3.	i. 24-26.	v. 3-6.	iii. 5, 8.
4.	22.	7-9.	23, 25, 27, 28.	15.	iv. 5.
7.	14.	iv. 1.	10.	19-22.	iii. 16-18.
10.	20.	2-4.	iii. 12-15.	25.	19.
15-17.	3, 4.	16.	ii. 19.	vi. 1-4.	20, 21.
18.	17.	22-24.	iii. 9, 10.	5-9.	22–iv. 1.
21-23.	16, 18, 19.	25, 26.	8, 9.	19, 20.	iv. 3, 4.
ii. 1, 2, 12.	21.	29.	8. iv. 6.	21, 22.	7, 8.
	ii. 5, 13.	31.	8.		
15.	14.	32.	12, 13.		
16.	i. 20, 22.				

In this grouping of the parallel passages in the two Epistles, regard has been had to the list of DE WETTE and MAYERHOFF. The relationship and connection of the two Epistles is greater than the similarity between the Gospel and first Epistle of John (see *Introd.* 1 Jno. § 3, 2. Biblework, pp. 7 ff.) and between the second Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of Jude (see Biblework on the former, § 4, p. 7). But the thorough diversity is even more surprising than the similarity. We often find the very same word, the same form of speech, and yet a different thought; and then, too, the same thought but modified by a special manner (iv. 22–24; Col. iii. 9, 10), or in an entirely different connection (i. 7, 10; Col. i. 14, 20), now presenting different

motives, again presented under different motives (i. 3–14; Col. i. 3–8; Eph. i. 16–ii. 10; Col. i. 15–ii. 18). If it be remembered that an agreement consisting merely in single words or phrases is very common indeed, so much so that a comparison between our Epistle and 1 Peter has been attempted with a view of maintaining the dependence of the former on the latter (WEISS, *Petrin. Lehrbegriff*, p. 426 ff.), a considerable number of parallel passages must either be omitted or declared unworthy of consideration, in deducing a conclusion. If, with DE WETTE, reference is made to the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* in our Epistle, to these we may oppose a long list from the Epistle to the Colossians (RUECKERT, p. 300 f.) [comp. ALFORD, *N. T.* Vol. III. *Prolegg.* p. 40], while the Epistles to the Corinthians, recognized as genuinely Pauline despite the most acute criticism, have more than any other. Particular attention, however, should be paid to the phrase: ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, which is peculiar to this Epistle (i. 3–20; ii. 6; iii. 16; vi. 12), especially in the last passage. Following up those sections which our Epistle alone has, either with a very faint verbal echo in the Epistle to the Colossians or without any parallel whatever (i. 3–14; iii. 10–21; iv. 5–15; v. 1, 2, 7–14, 23–31; vi. 10–17), we find passages containing the most important, profound, and comprehensive thoughts, sometimes in a throng of streaming words, again in the most delicate and exact coloring. Finally, it must not be overlooked that, while in the Epistle to the Colossians only a single passage can be found (ii. 21) with a reference to the Old Testament (Lev. v. 2), in our Epistle we find: iv. 7–10, a definite quotation with an explanation (Ps. lxviii. 19); v. 13, an indefinite citation (Isa. lx. 1; xxvi. 19); v. 31, a reference to Gen. ii. 24; vi. 2, to Exod. ii. 12, and also allusions, in iv. 25, 26 to Zech. viii. 16 and Ps. iv. 5, in i. 22 to Ps. viii. 7, and in ii. 17 to Isa. lvii. 19. Accordingly we are not at all warranted in inferring from the relationship of the two Epistles, a dependence of this Epistle upon that to the Colossians. If the individuality and independence of the latter cannot be denied, and this we attempt to prove in the *Introduction* to that Epistle (§ 1, 2), then they certainly cannot be denied in the case of the former. We thus reach the conclusion that both Epistles were written at the same time by the same Apostle. Comp. RUECKERT, pp. 291–305; HARLESS, *Introduction*, lxvii.–lxxvii.

DR. LANGE (*Romans*, pp. 21, 22) has accurately noted the difference and peculiarity of the two Epistles. In the Epistle to the *Ephesians* there obtains a grand universalism in entirely peculiar independence: Here, without any reference to personal, temporal, or local relations and circumstances, we are directed on all sides to the glory of the Church of Christ and the true Christianity given in her for each and every nation, without polemics or apology, purely from her origin and appearance, her growth and consummation, her ground and aim,—so that even after the pressing entreaty for the readers' prayers in his so trying position (vi. 19, 20) and the brief reference to Tychicus, who will give further oral intelligence (vi. 21, 22), the conclusion entirely universal in its scope, reverts to the brethren, to those who love the Lord (vi. 23, 24), not *ὑμῖν*, wishing them grace and peace as in the beginning. Besides the references to the Old Testament remarked above, the well-considered interchange of "ye" and "we" is a manifest proof of the universal tendency, embracing both Jews and Gentiles. The Epistle to the Colossians, on the contrary, concerns itself with one single local congregation, its special relations and circumstances.

[On the difference between the two Epistles, see Introduction to Colossians, § 2, also WORDSWORTH and ALFORD on that Epistle; the latter accepting the priority of the shorter Epistle, speaks of this one as "the flower and bloom of his moments, during those same days, of devotion and rest, when *he* wrought not so much in the Spirit, as the Spirit wrought in *him*"—"the free outflowing of the earnest spirit—to the mere surface-reader, without system, but to him that delves down into it, in system far deeper, and more recondite, and more exquisite: the greatest and most heavenly work of one, whose very imagination was peopled with the things in the heavens, and even his fancy rapt into the visions of God."—R.]

4. The *language* of this Epistle is also for the most part conditioned by this universalism. Hence BENGEL, after his note in i. 3, remarks: *Paulus scribit effectu per adversa sublimato: et singulare hæc epistola specimen præbet tractationis evangelicæ* IN THESI, *hujuque capitis v.* 3–14 *compendium ea evangelicum exhibet; inde nullum speciatim errorem aut vitium refutat aut redarguat, sed generatim incedit; et quantumcunque lucis in epistola ceteroqui parallela ad*

Colossenses ex historia ecclesiastica petatur, in hac epistola minus opus est—and on iii. 4: *Est hic liber valde sublimis et tamen omnium lectioni commissus; in hac epistola apertius et sublimius scripsit Paulus, quam antehac in ulla.* The Epistle does not concern itself with matter limited by given historical relations and particular phenomena or individualities, which by its concrete character would lead to shorter sentences and simpler statements. The universality of the subject, preparing from eternity down through the centuries and now developing itself through all centuries and circumstances unto the consummation in eternity, and the enthusiasm of the spirit possessed by this thought, reflect themselves in the fulness of language and the wonderful interlacing of sentences (see especially i. 3–14). The remarkable interruptions and resumptions (as ii. 1–5; iii. 1, 13) can be readily accounted for, with such a subject and in such enthusiasm, by the Apostle's habit of dictating his Epistles. In those parts where the Apostle touches upon given relations, as in the second part (chaps. iv.–vi.) the language and construction, though terse and precise, are yet simple and clear. RUECKERT: "We do not indeed find here the language of scientific statement, or that of sharp censure against prevailing faults, or that of deeply wounded personal feeling, as in the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians, nor yet that of hearty affectionateness, as in the Epistle to the Philippians; there is nothing of all this in our Epistle, and in these respects no comparison can be instituted."

5. The *opinions* respecting the character of this Epistle stand in remarkable agreement with each other as a whole, aside from isolated exceptions. CHRYSOSTOM: *Ἔστι δε νοημάτων μεστὴ ἡ ἐπιστολὴ, ὑψηλῶν καὶ δογμάτων· ὑψηλῶν σφόδρα γέμει τῶν νοημάτων καὶ ὑπερόγκων· ἃ γὰρ μηδαμοῦ σχεδὸν ἐφθέγξατο, ταῦτα ἐνταῦθα δηλοῖ.* ERASMUS: "*Stylus tantum dissonat a ceteris Pauli epistolis, ut alterius videri possit, nisi pectus atque indoles paulinæ mentis hanc prorsus illi vindicaret.*" GROTIUS describes the Epistle as "*rerum sublimitatem adæquans verbis sublimioribus, quam ulla habuit unquam lingua humana.*" WITSIUS characterizes it with special accuracy and excellence: "*Ita universam religionis Christianæ summam divina hac epistola exponit, ut exuberantem quandam non sermonis tantum evangelici παῤῥησίαν, sed et spiritus sancti vim et sensum, et caritatis Christianæ flammam quandam ex electo illo pectore emicantem, et lucis divinæ fulgorem quendam admirabilem inde elucentem, ut ebullientem potius, animadvertere liceat; idque tanta copia, ut superabundans illa cordis plenitudo ipsa animi sensa intimosque conceptus autem verba prolata, verba autem priora quæque subsequentia premant, urgeant, obruant.*"—With this the most important of the latest exegetes agree. [LUTHER (in the editions of the New Testament up to 1537) reckons this Epistle among "the best and noblest books of the New Testament, which show Christ to thee and teach all that is necessary and blessed for thee to know, even if thou shouldst never see or hear another book or doctrine." COLERIDGE (*Table Talk*, p. 82): "In this, the divinest composition of man, is every doctrine of Christianity, first, those doctrines peculiar to Christianity, and secondly, those precepts common to it with natural religion." Bishop ELLICOTT (Preface to 1st Edition) pays a tribute to the character of the Epistle, in confessing how far his labors fall below what it demands, using language that finds an echo in the heart of every faithful student of this stupendous revelation." Comp. SCHAFF, *History of the Apost. Church*, Am. ed., p. 326.—R.]

On the other hand the opinion advanced by DE WETTE is altogether untenable: that the Epistle to the Ephesians is really nothing more than a verbose expansion of the Colossian Epistle without individuality in purpose or reference, without position because without respect to false teachers, unworthy of the Apostle, poor in thought with its wordy style, overloaded with parentheses and additions, without connection. [Similarly RENAN (*St. Paul*, p. xx.), proving how the Epistle strikes a "surface reader." Comp. on the contrary SCHAFF, *Apost. Church*, p. 327: "As to style, in no other Epistle do the ideas flow in such an unbroken stream and such involved periods, as in that to the Ephesians. The perverted taste of some modern critics has pronounced this 'diffuseness,' 'verbosity,' *etc.* GROTIUS understood the matter better, when he said: '*Rerum sublimitatem adæquans verbis sublimioribus, quam alia habuit unquam lingua humana!*' The first chapter has, so to speak, a liturgical, psalmodic character, being as it were a glowing song in praise of the transcendent riches of the grace of God in Christ and the glory of the Christian calling."—R.] BEYSCHLAG's passing remark (*Christologie des N. T.*, p. 201), that our Epistle, through its dependence on that to the Colossians as well as through the lack

of freshness and terseness of style connected therewith, can raise doubts, but that still it must be regarded as a working up of the Epistle to the Colossians by the Apostle for a wider circle of readers, as well as HAUSRATH's (*Der Apostel Paulus*, 1865, p. 2) unproven opinion that the Epistle is "a letter to the Laodiceans wrought over by another hand," Rom. xvi. 1–16, being an accompanying letter to Ephesus,* are answered by the facts adduced above (under 2), taken from the two Epistles.

§ 3. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EPISTLE.

1. The exalted significance of the Epistle for all time lies in the fundamental idea and thought of the Epistle: *The Church of Jesus Christ a creation of the Father through the Son in the Holy Ghost, decreed from eternity, destined for eternity;* it is *the ethical cosmos*, which Redemption purposed and has realized in the cosmos instituted in creation; it is the family of God, gathered in the world and in history and still further to be gathered, the object of His nurture and care in time and eternity.—"This age of ours so lost and wandering in every direction respecting the idea and nature of the Church" (STIER), which has stumbled about from the ultra-montane ecclesiasticism demanding unconditional obedience to all its precepts and dogmas, "clear through the rationalistic troops, who prefer to build a Pythagorean ὁμακοεῖον (common audience hall) in the place of the ἐκκλησία, as far as the free churches and churches of the future, which in Rupp's fashion leaves only a ὅμαδος and ὄχλος without ἀκοή" (STIER), accepting even a mere religious fellowship by the side of others,—this erring age must find its bearings, be consoled and uplifted by such a thought as this.

2. *The ground and goal* of the Church is *Christ:* everything depends on the relation to Christ, according to which the relation to the Church is first determined. *Where Christ is, there is the Church*, even though in incipiency, and where the Church in truth is, there also Christ is and works. Christ and the Church of Christ are indeed there only, where His super-terrestrial eternal Personality is apprehended, where this is neither opposed nor in any way denied. [Hence Rationalism can flourish where the ministry is "a moral police," sustaining some Erastian petrifactions, but confessedly cannot found a Church; nor is this Epistle with its profound ecclesiology any favorite with "liberal Christians." This results not so much from the failure to conceive of the Church, as from the inability to sound the depths of the added and essential phrase: "in Christ."—R.] "In Christ!" is the qualification necessarily and involuntarily joined to all truth and all life.

3. The Church is to be recognized as *one, invisibly visible, thoroughly ethical life-sphere of the Holy Ghost.* As above the different national churches of the same confession, variously formed, or deformed and loosely organized, one confessional church [denomination] is to be sought and found, so above the different confessional churches, each professing to be *a* Christian Church, perhaps *the* Christian Church, there is the one Church of Jesus Christ. From this super-terrestrially eternal life-sphere the Church lives and labors and blesses, in the world and in time, among the nations. In her there is carried on an ethical life-process, moving the individual in his inmost and tenderest centre, away from an ever more deceitful estrangement from God to a blessed nearness to God, from enmity and bondage to sonship and heirship with God, from lust of sin through pardon of sin to glorious purity.

4. *As means of grace* we have *the word of God* becoming personal in the individual as well as in the communion, re-echoed in faith and prayer and song, in the heart and in the Church. Yet the word of God is not made so prominent, that the Sacrament is on this account to be lightly esteemed, as the position of baptism (iv. 5) shows.

5. As regards *polity*, it is only required, that *the organs for the ministry of the word* be efficient, that the members of the congregation stand in affectionate helpfulness toward, over and under each other. For the former it is necessary, that both the susceptibility to receive it, and the activity toward the congregation be unimpaired and unincumbered. Of presbyters and

* [PROF. HAUSRATH does not enter into critical questions, but Dr. HITZIG, of Heidelberg, is understood to be preparing a critical work in which the same view will be defended. This theory considers Rom. xvi. 1–16 to be genuine, but addressed to Ephesus before our Epistle was written. RENAN advances the same view in connection with his theory respecting Romans as a circular letter (p. lxxiii.). See my note, *Romans*, p. 425. Against the Laodicean destination, see below, § 5, 3, c. —R.]

bishops already existing nothing is said; nor is there the slightest hint which can be turned against the lay element, but rather every living Christian is regarded as a saint, a sanctified one, and as a member of the Body, whose Head is Christ. [It is significant that this most *churchly* Epistle has so little to support the exclusive claims of any form of church government. This ought to humble the pretensions of *jure divino* sectarianism. Indeed all Christians should be humbled, as we feel how little any one body of Christians fulfils the conception here given of the Body of Christ. It is through such humility that the true church of the future, not indistinctly alluded to here (iv. 13), will be ushered in.—R.]

6. The natural institutions, marital and domestic, established in creation, the *status œconomicus*, as well as *politicus*, find support, dignity and blessing with the *status ecclesiasticus* in the church, so that salvation redounds to their advantage; in fact they thus first attain their rights, in order to serve in turn the growth and good estate of the church. All that is essential for these and for moral relations in general (which have their home in the church, and like all that is human going to rack and ruin in homelessness without her) is here clearly recognized in a profound and extended view, and sketched in grand outline with wonderfully pregnant force.

In these points the exalted significance of this Epistle for all ages of the church will make itself felt.

[7. The character of the Epistle involves certain results in regard to commentators, which are obvious to one who carefully reviews their labors. "As the wonderful effect of the Spirit of inspiration on the mind of man is nowhere in Scripture more evident than in this Epistle, so, to discern those things of the Spirit, is the spiritual mind here more than any where required" (ALFORD). As one example, DE WETTE is cited, who, though so able, has allowed his prejudice against the Epistle (see § 4, 3) to make his commentary on it "hardly better than works of third-rate or fourth-rate men." But the same principle operates in another class of commentators: those who approach it in a believing spirit, but with minds ever on the alert to prevent Paul from saying anything contrary to their pre-conceived theological opinions. This class includes those of the most opposite views. Certainly this mode of dealing with "the writing of men inspired by the Third Person of the adorable Trinity" (ELLICOTT) is unwarrantable. It finds no warrant in the conception of the church here presented, for this implies growth, precluding the notion that in any given post-apostolic century all theological truth was exactly stated, however valuable such statements may be.—R.]

§ 4. THE AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE.

1. *The Apostle Paul* is designated as the author in the Epistle itself, not only in the address (i. 1), but also in the body of the Epistle (ii. 1), with great emotion, just as in 2 Cor. x. 1: *αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ Παῦλος ἀπόστολος παρακαλῶ*; Gal. v. 2; *ἴδε ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγων ὑμῖν*, and yet without imitation in a way entirely peculiar: *ἐγὼ Παῦλος ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν*. He thus refers to two things which are well known in his life: His *imprisonment*, mentioned in iv. 1; vi. 20 also, and that he is the *Apostle to the Gentiles* (iii. 7; Acts ix. 15; xxii. 21; xxvi. 17, 18). As he speaks in 1 Cor. xv. 9 with humility, and in Gal. i. 1, 12 with confidence and certainty of having received revelations from God, so here also he speaks humbly and yet as certain of his calling and illumination, of the revelation which has been imparted to him (iii. 3, 8, 9), referring explicitly to *σύνεσίν μου* (ver. 4). Those traits may be perceived here, which are found in the Epistles to the Romans (i. 1, 5, *etc.*) and Galatians, and in his life.—Still another fact is to be noted: the sending of Tychicus, who is commended to the church as a beloved brother and a faithful servant in the Lord. This agrees entirely with what is known respecting him from other sources (see on vi. 21).—Finally the character of the Epistle in thought and language confirm the Pauline origin (§ 2).

2. *The testimony of the ancient church* points without exception to the Epistle to the Ephesians as an Epistle of the Apostle Paul. No weight can be laid upon one passage in the Epistles of IGNATIUS, who suffered martyrdom in Rome between A. D. 105 and 108, since in the briefer recension of the text, it is said that Paul remembered them *ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ* (*i. e.*, in *every* letter, except in later Greek it cannot mean: in the *whole* letter, see on ii. 21); in the longer recension, however, the passage reads very differently (*πάντοτε ἐν ταῖς δεήσεσιν αὐτοῦ μνημονεύει ἡμῶν*), while

in the shortest (the oldest) it is wanting altogether. The allusions to our Epistle (ii. 8; iv. 26) in the letter of POLYCARP (who suffered martyrdom A. D. 168) to the Philippians (*Cap.* 1: εἰδότες ὅτι χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων; *cap.* 12: *ut his scripturis dictum est; irascimini et nolite peccare, et sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram*) can however be regarded as the earliest witness for our Epistle; although the first is slight, the second is quite definite and cannot refer in its conclusion to Deut. xxiv. 15, as MEYER* supposes. The testimony of the *Canon Muratori* belongs to the same period. According to WIESELER (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1847, pp. 815-857) and TISCHENDORF (*When were our Gospels written*, p. 6); this was composed in the year A. D. 170, according to LAURENT (*Neutest. Studien*, p. 198), before A. D. 160. This authority refers to what was then generally acknowledged, and hence to a much earlier period. It names among the Epistles to seven churches written by Paul, *ad Ephesos* as *secunda.* Nor are definite citations wanting in IRENÆUS, who suffered martyrdom A. D. 202: Eph. v. 30 [*Adv. Hær.* v. 2, 36; also Eph. v. 13 in i. 5, 8, where it is implied that the Valentinians accepted the Epistle as authentic.—R.]; in CLEMENS ALEX. († 220): Eph. iv. 17-19; v. 21 ff., *etc.* [*Strom.* iv. § 65, *Pæd.* i. § 18.—R]; while ORIGEN († 254) names ἡ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους as Paul's [*Philos.* 6, 54]. Finally EUSEBIUS cites our Epistle among the *homologoumena.*

In addition to this testimony from the church that from the heretics must not be overlooked. MARCION (about the middle of the 2d century) has our Epistle in his Canon, though under the title: *To the Laodiceans.* Comp. § 5, 1. VALENTINUS, "the most profound, most rich in *esprit*, thought and imagination of the Gnostics," who died about A. D. 160, cites it as a Pauline Epistle, and also as "Scripture" (see BLEEK, *Vorlesungen über Kolosser*, p. 187, f.): [Comp. ALFORD, *Prolegg.*, pp. 6 ff —R.]—Even DE WETTE acknowledges that the ecclesiastical recognition of the Epistle opposes powerfully the grounds for doubt on this subject.

3. Doubts respecting the genuineness of the Epistle were first published by USTERI (*Paulin. Lehrbegriff*, 1824), occasioned by oral expressions of SCHLEIERMACHER, who however in his lectures on the Introduction to the N. T. (pp. 165 ff., 194) only suggests the conjecture, that the Epistle to the Ephesians was written by an attendant of Paul in accordance with his suggestions. DE WETTE in his *Einleitung*, § 146, and yet more decidedly in his *Commentary*, sought to establish these doubts, and to prove the author to have been a gifted disciple of the Apostle in the Apostolic age. His proof did not however find general sympathy, even among the "liberal" theologians, such as RUECKERT (see § 2, 2), who makes the following apt remarks in opposition to this view: "We find in this Epistle again that man, who, exalted high above his times, could have as his equal only a few, and according to history had none such, since its silence would have been impossible, had there been yet another to stand beside him or to walk in his footsteps. Only such a man as Paul can be the author. If then he is not the author, show me the spirit in those times who is equal to him! Such an one could not walk through this world and leave no trace behind; I ask then, who is he and where? In the ranks of the imitators, the compilers, the counterfeiters, he is not to be found: where then shall I look for him? It is Paul and no one else!" The attack of DE WETTE contains also in itself a peculiar contradiction, since it regards the Epistle to the Ephesians as a wordy expansion of the Epistle to the Colossians, denying the author's independence, ascribing to him poverty of thought, and then charges him with the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα and ἅπαξ νοούμενα, which evidence originality and fertility.

[ALFORD meets DE WETTE's objections thus (*Prolegg.*, p. 9): "Let every one of DE WETTE's positions be granted, and caried to the utmost; and the more in number and stronger they are, the more reason there will be to infer, that the only account to be given of a writing, so unlike St. Paul's, obtaining universal contemporary acceptance as his, is, that it was his own genuine composition. Then we should have remaining the problem, to account for the Apostle having so far departed from himself: a problem for the solution of which much acquaintance with himself and the circumstances under which he wrote would be required." But ALFORD by no means admits that the problem is reduced to this form by DE WETTE's objections. Rarely

* [MEYER (4th ed. p. 27) intimates that *in his scripturis* refers to the O. T., because the Apostolic fathers never thus speak of the N. T. There is the more reason for this view just here, because *in sacris literis* occurs immediately before. Still even Meyer admits that the *connection* of the two passages cited by Polycarp may arise from a recollection of our Epistle.—R.]

does even "subjective criticism" offer so contradictory a theory. Comp. HARLESS (*Einleitung*, pp. lxvi. ff.); MEYER, *Einleitung* (4th ed., pp. 22 ff.); DAVIDSON, *Introduction*, I., p. 352 ff. —R.]

The assertion of EWALD, that the Epistle is more rhetorical than Paul *was in the habit* of writing, yet as a whole *very worthy* of the name it bears on its face, placing it nearer to the Apostle than the Pastoral Epistles, and yet ascribing its authorship to a friend and pupil of the Apostle between A. D. 75–80, has no external support and this internal refutation, that no friend and pupil of the Apostle could possibly play such a prank as to represent himself as *Paul*, the Apostle to the Gentiles in bonds, honored with revelation, praying for the church, and requiring their supplications (see 1, above). This is an entirely different matter from the question respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews, left anonymous.

That this Epistle should be rejected by the Tübingen school (SCHWEGLER, *Nachapost. Zeitalter*, ii. p. 330 ff., and by Master BAUR, ZELLER'S *Theolog. Jahrbücher*, 1844, 2, p. 378 ff.; *Paulus*, p. 418 ff.) as a Montanist or Gnostic production, was to be expected from the animus of this school, but in the present state of exegesis and information respecting the character of both Gnosticism and Montanism, can create no uneasiness as far as the Epistle to the Ephesians is concerned. The terms πλήρωμα, ἀρχή, αἰών, κοσμοκράτωρ, κ. τ. λ. in this Epistle are not to be taken according to the Gnostic terminology, and, however it may be wished by some, it is not possible to discover in the phrase πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ (iii. 10), the σοφία returning into the Pleroma, or in iii. 21 the doctrine of the Æons, or in v. 28 the Syzygies of the Gnostics, especially of the Valentinians, or in iv. 13 the Montanist point of view. For there can be found in our Epistle by considerate exegesis as little of the universalistic character of Gnosticism, which is pervaded by the most adventurous theosophistic and dualistic views, teaching about a physical-life process instead of a moral one, as of the opposite Montanism, which on the basis of a prophetic system, ecstatic in form and chiliastic in origin, substitutes asceticism for morality, running off into rigorism; so that the Tübinger are peculiar enough to rest on no other basis than their own assertions, especially as the Epistle to the Ephesians existed before Montanism and even before the Gnosticism of Valentinus, while these systems stand in the most complete antagonism to the fundamental thoughts and detailed statements of the Epistle (see 2). Comp. LANGE, *Apostol. Zeitalter*, I. 1, p. 119 ff.; KLÖPPER, *De origine epp. ad Ephes. et Coloss.*, 1853; RAEBINGER, *De Christolog. Paulin.*, p. 42 ff.

[RENAN calls this Epistle "doubtful." He wavers between the theory of the later origin (on the ground of Gnostic features and the conception of marriage presented here differing from 1 Cor. vii., *etc.*) and one similar to that of EWALD: "That it was composed during his (Paul's) life, under his eye, in his name, is not improbable." He suggests Timothy as the writer, especially as his name is omitted here, joining with this the notion of a circular letter, afterwards called Ephesians, because coming first to Ephesus, *etc.* The two theories contradict each other. As for the latter, if RENAN regards the Epistle as "*chargée de mots inutiles et de repetitions*" (p. xix.), such a quasi-forger would scarcely employ useless words and repeat himself as he does in chap. iv. 25, where he not only forbids lying, but commands to speak the truth. Still the whole theory accords better with the character of the *St. Paul of Renan* than with that of the *St. Paul of history*. There is as much truth as ever in the remark of ELLICOTT: "The objections have been so fairly and fully confuted that they can no longer be considered to deserve any serious attention."—R.]

§ 5. THE READERS OF THE EPISTLE.

1. *The address* (i. 1) contains a definition of the place, to which the Epistle is directed: ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. The circle of readers is accordingly the Church in Ephesus, if this definition be correct. It is wanting, however, in ℵ. B., which belong to the fourth century, and in cod. 67 of the twelfth. In the first, the *Sinaiticus*, it was originally omitted, but it is added by the otherwise skilful corrector, whom TISCHENDORF designates with C. In the *Codex Vaticanus* the original omission was modified at a later date, as TISCHENDORF has shown in opposition to HUG (*Stud. und Krit.*, 1847, p. 133); in cod. 67 it was found originally, but afterwards erased. It is found besides in A. D. E. F. G. K. L. and others. The versions from the *Peshito* (simple

Syriac) and the *Itala*, which may have existed in the second century, all sustain this definition in the address. Our Epistle has been called the Epistle to the *Ephesians* since the middle of the second century (see § 4, 2).

In favor of the Ephesian destination of the Epistle we have also the testimony of TERTULLIAN (*contra Marcion*, 5, 11): *prætereo hic et de alia epistola, quam nos ad Ephesios præscriptam habemus, hæretici vero ad Laodicenos;* (and the same 5, 17): *ecclesiæ veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos, sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator; nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes apostolus scripserit, dum ad quosdam.* From this it follows: Since the middle of the second century the same Epistle, which the ancient church designated and cited as the Epistle to the Ephesians was designated and used by Marcion, and not by him only but by the other heretics, (*hæretici*), as the Epistle to the Laodiceans. TERTULLIAN regarded Marcion as the author of this alteration (*interpolare gestiit*), which related chiefly to the title only (ἡ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους) agreeing, as it of course did, with the address (τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ), and not to the exact contents of the Ephesian or Laodicean letter, from which the materials for the discussion were drawn. Such a proceeding is easily explicable from the passionate, energetic and proud character of Marcion; besides he accepted Paul alone among the Apostles, and only ten of his Epistles in a very mutilated form, feeling himself entitled from his Asiatic origin to decide on this point. In the relations of the Apostle Paul to the Church at Ephesus, and in the universal character of this Epistle (§ 2, 1, 2), beside the parallel Epistle to the Colossians, and in the mention of an Epistle to Laodicea (Col. iv. 16), Marcion had occasion enough to recoin the Epistle to the Ephesians into a suitable support for his opinions and tendencies. With this agrees remarkably what is said in the *Canon Muratorianus* (see WIESELER, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1847, p. 828; LAURENT, *Neutestamentl. Studien*, p. 198): *Fertur etiam una ad Laodicenses alia ad Alexandrinos Pauli nomine fictæ ad hæresem Marcionis et alia plura, quæ in Catholicam ecclesiam recipi non poterant; fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit.* When then EPIPHANIUS cites Eph. iv. 5, 6, from Marcion's πρὸς Λαοδικέας, and TERTULLIAN opposes Marcion out of a common text, the acceptation of a *partial* mutilation and alteration of the text by Marcion best meets the facts of the case, and it seems better to accept with WIGGERS (*Stud. und Krit.*, 1841, p. 429), that ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ was written and read by Marcion instead of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ (i. 1) to conform with the title (ἡ πρὸς Λαοδικέας), rather than with TISCHENDORF and MEYER, that all closer local definition was wanting [*i. e.* in Marcion's text]. For some kind of local statement is indispensably required after τοῖς οὖσιν, as will appear from a comparison of the Pauline inscriptions which enter into the discussion here (Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1; Phil. i. 1). As regards Rom. i. 7, the words ἐν Ῥώμῃ are wanted only in isolated manuscripts. So that the omission of every local definition seems rather to have arisen in consequence of this manipulation of Marcion and in view of the remarkably universal tone of the Epistle.* It was not until the fourth century that BASIL THE GREAT (*Contra Eunom.* 2, 19) announced himself as convinced by manuscripts, that the address of the Epistle to the Ephesians read as follows: τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. JEROME, who for his part reads ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the text, remarks on chap. i. 1: *quidam curiosius quam necesse est, putant, ex eo, quod Moysi dictum sit: hæc dices filiis Israel: qui est misit me, etiam eos, qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fideles, essentiæ vocabulo nuncupatos, ut ab eo qui est hi qui sunt appellentur. Alii vero simpliciter non ad eos, qui sint, sed qui Ephesi sancti et fideles sint, scriptum arbitrantur.* The former attempts to prove from the fact of Christians being called οἱ ὄντες, that Christ is first really ὁ ὤν; the latter refers, as TISCHENDORF (N. T. ed. 7, maj. I. p. 441), affirms, to the explanation and opinion of ORIGEN.—Accordingly this Epistle is to be regarded as addressed to Ephesus.

2. *The Epistle itself* and *Paul's relation to the Ephesian Church* are at least not in opposition to this view. During the second missionary journey, A. D. 53 or 54 (Acts xvi.–xviii. 22) on his return from Corinth, Paul came with Aquila and Priscilla to Ephesus; these he left there

* [MEYER (*Einleitung*, p. 9) suggests, too, the influence of the incorrect inference from passages in the Epistle, that it was addressed to those unknown to the Apostle who were moreover beginners in Christianity. On these points see below (2). The propriety of this suggestion will appear when we consider that "subjective criticism" found favor in early days as well as now. The "critical" as well as "theological" discourses of the present time are often enough those of the "seething" post-apostolic centuries.—R.]

and hastened to the feast at Jerusalem. This excellent pair in connection with Apollos labored still further for the gospel. During the third extended journey from A. D. 56 or 57–59 Paul came again to Ephesus and remained there nearly three years (Acts xix.). Although he at first found some sympathy among the Jews, he was obliged to yield to his opponents and betake himself to the Gentiles, until Demetrius, the goldsmith (silversmith), excited an uproar against the Apostle, which drove him from the city. He won both Jews and Greeks for Christ (Acts xix. 10; xx. 21). An intimate relation was formed between Paul and the church, as is shown in the farewell at Miletus (Acts xx. 17–38), on his return to Palestine, when he fell into the imprisonment at Cesarea, A. D. 60 and 61. The church comprised both Jews and Gentiles, but the latter were in the majority, since the tumult which was excited by the silversmiths in their anxiety about their gains, was far more considerable than the Jewish opposition. The city of Ephesus, being the capital of proconsular Asia and celebrated for trade, art and science as well as on account of the temple of Diana, was a place well adapted for the formation of a church of extended activity. It now lies in ruins, and in its place stands a little village called *Ajasoluk* from *ἅγια θεολόγου*, the holy place of the theologian, in remembrance of the labors of John the Theologian.*

Just such a city as Ephesus would give occasion to the Apostle in his imprisonment, to present his universal and cosmical view in a letter to the dear church. Even though a "more *personal* than official character" (SCHENKEL) may not be found in the address (i. 1): *τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, which is similar to that to the personally unknown church in Rome (Rom. i. 7), and to Phil. i. 1, still the whole Epistle is pervaded by a lively interest in this church, the main elements of which are Gentiles (§ 2, 1). The universalism pervading throughout the Epistle throws the special references into the background and refers to the sending of Tychicus for oral communications. When the Apostle (i. 15) writes, he had heard of their faith and love to all saints, this is to be explained by the separation for years; he does not say that he had *only* heard of it. From iii. 2 we can by no means infer the non-acquaintance of the church with the Apostle, nor from iv. 21 the non-acquaintance of the Apostle with the church (see *Exeg. Notes in loco*, and RINCK, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1849, p. 953 f.)—It might have been expected, that Paul would mention or hint at some special personal relatives in this Epistle; but he does not do it, though the Epistle is one addressed to a beloved church and full of lively sympathy. Yet at the same time he gives no ground for a justifiable doubt, whether this Epistle was written to Ephesus. No fact in the Epistle compels or justifies a belief that it was not intended for Ephesus, as the historical evidences require.

[The Ephesian destination of this Epistle has been denied by CONYBEARE (C. and HOWSON, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, Vol. II., pp. 486 ff.). Owing to the great popularity of this

* ["The city stood on the south of a plain about five miles long from east to west, and three miles broad, the north boundary being Mount Gallesius, the east Mount Pactyas, the south Mount Coressus, and on the west it was washed by the sea. The sides of the mountains were very precipitous, and shut up the plain like a stadium or race-course." (LEWIN, quoted in ALFORD). It was, in the time of the Apostle, an influential centre, a point of importance to be won for Christ. It is highly probable that the churches of Colosse and the neighborhood (Col. ii. 1) were founded as the result of intercourse with Ephesus (see *Introd.* to Colossians, p. 6). As regards its history, present condition, the temple of Diana, and the worship of that goddess, see SMITH'S *Dictionary of Geography*, and his *Bible Dictionary*, WINER, *Realwörterbuch* in all three under the article "Ephesus;" but especially the interesting and vivacious description in CONYBEARE and HOWSON, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, Vol. II., chap. 16; comp. EADIE, pp. viii. ff., and the authorities there cited. The classical references are given by ALFORD, *Prolegg.* p. 11. The main facts are as follows: The city was wealthy and well-known, its chief attraction, aside from its importance as a trading point, being the temple of Diana, to whom the city was sacred. This wonder of the world, a Greek building of the Ionic order, was burnt by Herostratus, to gain immortality for himself, on the night of the birth of Alexander the Great (B. C. 355), but was rebuilt at great cost in the course of centuries, one may say, contributions having been made by all Greece and Western Asia. "A many-breasted idol of wood, rude as an African fetich, was worshipped in its shrine, in some portion of which a meteoric stone may have been inserted, the token of its being 'the image that fell from Jupiter'—τοῦ διοπετοῦς" (EADIE). "Oxford in England is not more Oxford on account of its University, than Ephesus was Ephesus on account of the temple of Diana" (HODGE). On the title νεωκόρος, "temple-sweeper," the most honorable designation of the city, see CONY. and HOW., ii. p. 76. The effect of the preaching of the Apostle Paul on this idolatrous worship is stated in Acts xix. 17 ff. It is not necessary to find any allusion to this temple in certain passages in our Epistle (iii. 20, 21), yet it does seem that it is quite as fair to adduce such a possible allusion in favor of the Ephesian destination of the Epistle, as to advance such internal grounds against it as have gained considerable acceptance. At all events the character of the city is not against the genuineness of the commonly received title.—R.]

work, DEAN ALFORD has answered its arguments in detail (*Prolegg.* pp. 13–18). The same popularity required at least a summing up of the question at this point, before passing to the theories mentioned below, so that the reader may see how little real ground there is for the view which these charming authors have made so current. On external diplomatic and historical grounds, only thus much is proven: that so early as the time of BASIL copies existed without having the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the inscription, as indeed these are now wanting in ℵ B., but not even he, much less the other fathers, doubted that the true title was "to the Ephesians," as it reads in all the older Uncials; that MARCION (not the best authority) called it the Epistle to the Laodiceans. This scarcely amounts to more than a state of things just short of absolute unanimity. The most probable explanation of the fact of this omission is that of ALFORD, who thinks it was occasioned by the catholic subject of the Epistle, made "very possibly by churches among whom it was read, and with a view to generalize the reference of its contents." On internal grounds but one objection deserves an answer, *viz.*, that it is scarcely possible that Paul could have written to such a church where he was so well-known without sending personal greetings. A sufficient answer is this, that in the Epistles addressed to those churches where he was personally unknown (Romans, Colossians) there are most personal greetings to and from individuals; and in every case where he was known few or none (see the close of the various Pauline Epistles). It is to meet these two difficulties that the theories enumerated below have been suggested, though MARCION's position has involved Col. iv. 16 in the problem.—R.]

3. *The attempts* to explain what is singular in this fact, which must always be recognized, fail in four directions.

a) Many, following a few manuscripts, some of them important, and BASIL (see 1) reject all local designation, as SCHNECKENBURGER: "to the saints, who really are such," MATTHIES: "to all the saints who are there," CREDNER: "to the saints who are also real believers;" so also WEISS (HERZOG's *Real encykl.* 19, p. 481). This is not only against the usage of the language (see 1), the attempts at translation themselves showing that the words are incomprehensible and meaningless without a local definition, but it also stamps the Epistle as a *Catholic Epistle*, for which it has never been held by the church, not even by WEISS, who limits it to the totality of the churches in Asia Minor, and considers it encyclical (see *ibid.* p. 482). Were this letter a companion to the πρὸς Ἑβραίους, it should have been entitled πρὸς Ἕλληνας rather than πρὸς Ἐφεσίους.

b) Others consider it an *encyclical* letter, addressed to Ephesus and yet intended for the vicinity in a narrower or wider circle. JACOB USHER (*Annales V. et N. T. ad a.* 64, p. 686) started this theory, and claimed that Paul has inserted no local name, leaving it to the bearer to add it. [EADIE (p. 24 f) gives his language in full, as well as a long list of the supporters of his theory.—R.] Following him are a great many authors who suggest the most various modifications of his view. Some consider it a circular letter for Ephesus and its affiliated churches (HARLESS and others), others for Ephesus and the churches connected with it (BEZA and others), or for the Gentile Christians of Asia (STIER, HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis* I. 1, p. 372) or for these exclusive of Ephesus (KOPPE and others), or for Laodicea and the neighboring churches, such as Hierapolis (BLEEK). [Among the supporters of this "limited encyclical" view which implies the general correctness of the title: To the Ephesians, we must class some of the most judicious of modern historians and commentators, such as TURNER, HODGE, SCHAFF, ELLICOTT, LANGE. Dr. LANGE with some positiveness says (*Introd.* Romans, p. 16) that in Col. iv. 16: "We are to understand rather the Epistle to the Ephesians as intended also for Laodicea, the last of the Ephesian Cycle of congregations." HODGE merely says: "Perhaps the most probable solution of the problem is, that the Epistle was written to the Ephesians and addressed to them, but being intended specially for the Gentile Christians as a class, rather than for the Ephesians as a church, it was designedly thrown into such a form as to suit it to all such Christians in the neighboring churches, to whom no doubt the Apostle wished it to be communicated." ELLICOTT, while holding that the Ephesian destination "is not open to very serious doubt," is led by the authority of ℵ. to adopt the view of USHER, regarding the Epistle as "left studiously general in form, and free from distinctive notices." OLSHAUSEN, MACKNIGHT, and many others, especially CONYBEARE (see above under 2) adopt the encyclical

view, without admitting that Ephesus was the primary destination.—R.] But Paul has already shown in Gal. i. 1: "Unto the churches of Galatia," 2 Cor. i. 1: "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia," how he designates a circular letter, and gives an example in 1 Cor. i. 2, how he writes when in the address to a local church he has still in mind the adjacent churches, and one in particular. But of this there is no trace to be found here; hence the view that the Epistle to the Ephesians is an encyclical letter seems to be unfounded, and only an arbitrary means of avoiding a greater difficulty, all the more so, when the modern modification is added, that the Apostle had entrusted several copies to Tychicus, so that he could insert the name of the place on the spot (BENGEL, RUECKERT and others). Besides in that case another riddle is proposed: how does it happen that only copies for Ephesus have become known? [Nor does this theory meet the internal difficulty, since Paul in just such an encyclical letter (2 Cor.) goes into details to an extent that forbids our supposing the wider destination to have been any reason for the absence of personal greetings.—R.]

c) The opinion, based on Col. iv. 16, and Marcion, that our Epistle is that to Laodicea, is very peculiar, if it be claimed at the same time that it was intended for Ephesus also (GROTIUS, AUGER). The same Epistle could not be addressed to two so different churches. [Comp. Col. iv. 16, pp. 85, 86. The acceptance of "Laodiceans" and "Laodicea" in the title and address is altogether unwarranted,—a mere fiction to meet a single fact of no great importance, and involving various assumptions; and this strange inconsistency that Paul wrote two letters at the same time, one to Laodicea and the other to Colosse, sending no greetings to Laodicea in the letter intended for that point, but in *the other one* (Col. iv. 15) sent elsewhere. Even RENAN rejects it most decidedly. Still this view has been supported by MILL, WETSTEIN, the younger VITRINGA, PALEY, HOLZHAUSEN, and others.—R.]

d) Finally we can put on record as pure hypothesis the view of MEYER: *Paul,* with whose circumstances the Asiatic Tychicus, who is used again as "emissary" (2 Tim. iv. 12) and mentioned together with the Ephesian Trophimus (Acts xx. 4), was entirely entrusted, might have had special motives (the Jewish accusation, Acts xxi. 28, 29, and the avarice of Felix, Acts xxiv. 26) in the circumstances of his imprisonment and the watch kept on him for composing (on the score of prudence) a letter to this very church, with which he stood on the *most confident* footing, *without* presenting any personal reference or special circumstances. [This theory of MEYER is based on his opinion that the letter was written during the imprisonment at Cesarea (see § 6). But it ought to be added that MEYER is very positive in accepting the genuineness of the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ as well as the exclusively Ephesian destination of the Epistle, views which he distinctly re-affirms in the preface to his 4th edition.—It is perhaps well to close this section with a list of some authors who agree with the view advocated by Dr. Braune: *viz.*. that this Epistle was addressed to Ephesus and to no other church: CALVIN, BUCER, WITSIUS, LARDNER, PROF. STUART of Andover, MEYER, DAVIDSON, WIESELER, ALFORD, WORDSWORTH, EADIE, SCHENKEL and very many others.—R.]

§ 6. TIME AND PLACE OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE.

The time and place are dependent on each other. Paul writes as prisoner (iii. 1; iv. 1; vi. 20), hence between A. D. 59 and 64, either at Cesarea or at Rome. As a starting-point we must remember that the three Epistles, to the Ephesians, the Colossians, and to Philemon, were written at the same time. The Epistle to the Colossians (iv. 10-14) shows us the Apostle surrounded by the same companions sending salutations as in that to Philemon (vers. 23, 24). In the Epistles to the Ephesians (vi. 21, 22) and to the Colossians (iv. 7-9) we find the same messenger with the same commission; this, in connection with the many almost *verbatim* parallel passages, places the contemporaneousness of the Epistles above doubt. Now according to 2 Tim. iv. 12, the Apostle sent Tychicus from Rome to Ephesus. At that time Luke was still with him, Demas had forsaken him, Mark was expected, and to Timothy he was writing. This points evidently to some other time than that required by our Epistles. According to Col. i. 1, Timothy was with Paul, as in Phil. i. 1. According to Col. iv. 7-14, as well as Philemon 23, 24, Aristarchus, Mark, Jesus Justus, Epaphras, Luke, Demas were with him. Aristarchus went with them from Cesarea to Rome (Acts xxvii. 2). Timothy, Aristarchus, Tychicus journeyed to Je-

rusalem with the Apostle (Acts xx. 4). Hence we can infer nothing definite respecting the time of the composition of this Epistle from Paul's companions. The Apostle was a person of great power of attraction, restlessly active, using his helpers as became necessary. Hence constant change. That the coming together of these men about Paul, who was the centre of all missionary activity would be more easily brought about in Cesarea than in Rome, decides nothing; they did come with him to Rome, to him at Rome, and thence were sent out to return thithei again. Accordingly special attention has been directed to one point, *viz.*, the passages respecting Tychicus (Eph. vi. 21, 22; Col. iv. 7-9).

The mention of Onesimus in the latter passage is of special importance. The remarks of LANGE (Romans, p. 15) against SCHENKEL, who with MEYER [THIERSCH, HAUSRATH] and others, following the lead of SCHULTZ (*Stud. und Krit.*, 1829, pp. 612–17), holds that the Epistle was written from Cesarea, are quite correct. Even WIGGERS (*Stud. und Krit.*, 1841, pp. 436-450), who after weighing with great circumspection the arguments for Cesarea and for Rome, decides for the former, does not find those drawn from the companions sufficient. It cannot be perceived why Onesimus should have fled to Jerusalem rather than to Rome; since from the intercourse with Rome, and the sea route and the prospects in the metropolis, this was much nearer. Nor can anything be inferred from the expense, since this would scarcely be reckoned with much care. The fugitive would have been afraid of the *fugitivarii*, but not have fled from them. Nor is any proof to be based upon the position of the cities, Colosse and Ephesus. Even the *custodia militaris* does not help us to decide: the confinement in Cesarea would hardly have been stricter than in Rome. Two reasons are decisive in Wiggers' opinion: 1) that, if Tychicus travelled with Onesimus through Ephesus to Colosse, and hence came from Rome, Onesimus would have been mentioned in the Epistle to the Ephesians also; he is not named, and hence was no longer with Tychicus, but separated from him, left behind in Colosse. It is inconceivable however, why Paul ought to have mentioned in a letter to the Ephesians a slave entirely unknown to them, just as in an Epistle to Colosse, where he belonged. 2) Paul could not have said that he had sent Tychicus to Ephesus (vi. 22), if he in going from Rome [to Colosse] must of necessity pass through Ephesus; in that case the route would have led him to Ephesus, not Paul's sending of him. This remarkable reason is rejected even by Meyer, who agrees with Wiggers.

If on the contrary we call to our aid the situation of the Apostle in his imprisonment, it is clear, that in Rome, the capital of the Empire, to which he had already addressed his most important Epistle, the importance of Ephesus, the capital of Asia, would appear with especial strength to his mind, and at the same time the universality of the Gospel, the importance of the Gentile Christian Church there, the fundamental thought of our Epistle. The place of composition, therefore, indicates the time, probably the beginning of the imprisonment. Paul was in Cesarea from A. D. 59, and from the spring of 61 or 62 in Rome. *Hence the Epistle to the Ephesians was written in A. D.* 61 *or* 62. [With the usual variations in chronology the great majority of commentators and historians agree in assigning this Epistle to the early part of the imprisonment at Rome. See MEYER for the best defence of the other view. RENAN, mainly on internal grounds, thinks this group of Epistles, if genuine, was composed at Rome toward the close of the Apostle's life (p. ix.).—R.]

The priority of the Ephesian Epistle to that to the Colossians will doubtless be accepted as most probable (see *Introd. to Colossians*, § 2, 1, p. 8). It is certain that nothing can be inferred in regard to this point from *καὶ ὑμεῖς* (Eph. vi. 21), because the contrast with the Colossians, as those to whom Tychicus first came, is not indicated at all, nor can it be proven from the context (See *Exeg. Notes in loco*). Nor can the priority of the Colossian Epistle be concluded from the ungrounded opinion that Colosse was the first and immediate goal for Tychicus.* We may rather suppose, that with the universal thought respecting the Church in Jesus Christ, which impelled Paul to the Ephesian Epistle, the application of the universal complex truth to the special necessities of the Colossian Church might first have come into full view, than to claim that through his writing to the church at Colosse, whose needs had been made known to him by Epaphras and

* [These two grounds are advanced by MEYER, who considers the internal, psychological grounds to be altogether indecisive. But the second reason falls to the ground with the theory that the Epistles were written at Cesarea. Were our Epistle referred to in Col. iv. 16, then it was certainly written first.—R.]

Onesimus, Ephesus as capital of Asia had suggested itself to him and the universalism of the Christianity of the Gentile churches, and that he was thus led to write the Epistle to the Ephesians. The former supposition is supported further by an incidental notice. In the address to Colosse Timothy is mentioned with Paul (Col. i. 1); in the Epistle to the Ephesians he is not mentioned and this is the more remarkable, since Timothy was well known in Ephesus (1 Tim. i. 3). Hence it is scarcely probable that he was at Rome when Paul wrote to Ephesus, but he must have been there when he wrote to Colosse. The most simple theory is that Paul had already finished the Epistle to the Ephesians, when Timothy returned from some errand at a distance.* The Apostle then writes to Colosse, and both letters are sent away, the former written probably towards the end of the summer, the latter at the beginning of autumn. Finally HUTHER's proof for the probable priority of the Colossian Epistle, deduced from the fact that in the Ephesian letter " an unmistakable fulness of language prevails," while the Colossian Epistle is distinguished "by a compact brevity," proves rather the opposite: the briefer form is usually the later one, as the shorter catechism follows the larger. Comp. my remarks on the Epistles of John, LANGE's *Comm.*, p. 16. [HAUSRATH thinks that both were written at one sitting as it were, but the whole question involves conjectures merely. The view which accepts the priority of the Epistle to the Colossians admits of the beautiful theory respecting the Apostle's state of mind in writing the two, which ALFORD sets forth (*Prolegg.* pp. 41, 42) but aside from this there is no advantage whatever to be derived from a decision of the question. As to the argument from the contents of the Epistles, it is manifestly inconclusive, since A-LAPIDE, BÖHMER, CREDNER, SCHNECKENBURGER, LARDNER, and many others agree with Braune in assigning the earlier origin on this ground to our Epistle, while SCHLEIERMACHER, HARLESS, NEANDER, WIGGERS, DE WETTE, BLEEK, SCHENKEL reach the opposite conclusion. So too ELLICOTT, DAVIDSON, ALFORD; EADIE is very cautious in accepting this view.—R.]

§ 7. LITERATURE.

Among the numerous commentaries on all or a number of the Epistles of this Apostle we mention:

KOPPE: *Nov. Testam. Vol.* VI, *Eph. ad Galatas, Thess., Ephes.*, Göttingen, 1778. (The 2d and 3d editions, 1791 and 1824, were revised by Tychsen).—J. D. MICHAELIS: *Paraphrase und Anmerkungen über die Briefe Pauli an die Galat., Ephes., Philip., Koloss., Thess., Tim., Tit., Philemon.*, Göttingen, 1750 (2d edition, 1769).—DE WETTE: *Exegetisches Handbuch über das Neue Testament, Band* 2, *Theil* 4, 1843 (2d edition, 1847).—MEYER: *Kritisch-exeget. Commentar über das N. Testament, Abtheilung* 8, 1843; 3d edition, 1859. [The *fourth* enlarged and improved edition (1867) of this invaluable commentary has been used in preparing the additions in the present volume; and Dr. Braune's citations have been carefully compared with it.—R.]—OLSHAUSEN: *Bibl. Commentar über das N. Testament, Band* 4, 1840. [Accessible to the English reader through the translation of Prof. Kendrick].—SCHENKEL in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, 1862. [A second edition appeared in 1867. The work shows the author's ability, but in point of grammatical accuracy leaves no room to doubt the propriety of translating in its stead the commentary of Dr. Braune, altogether aside from the change of theological position on the part of Dr. Schenkel, which made it necessary to offer to the German public a choice between two separate works on the three Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians.—R.]—FLATT: *Vorlesungen über Gal. und Eph.*, published by Kling, 1828.—BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS: *Commentar über die Briefe Pauli an die Epheser und Kolosser*, published from his manuscripts and reports of his lectures by Kinnel and Schauer, 1847.—EWALD: *Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Pauli übersetzt und erklärt*, 1857.

Among the special commentaries the following are to be noted: RUECKERT: *Der Brief Pauli an die Ephesier erläutert und vertheidigt*, 1834.—G. CH. A. HARLESS: *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Ephesier*, 1834; 2d unaltered edition, 1858. [Pronounced by Ellicott: "one of the best, if not the very best commentary that has ever yet appeared on any single portion of Holy Scripture." Largely used by both author and editor in the present volume.—R.]

*[So HUG, but SCHOTT argues precisely the other way: that Timothy was present when the Colossian letter was written and after he had been sent on some errand, Paul wrote to the Ephesians; so inconclusive is this circumstance.—R.]

STIER: *Die Gemeinde in Christo Jesu. Auslegung des Briefs an die Epheser.* Two vols., 1848, 1849.—Extracts from the same great work for popular use: *Der Brief an die Epheser. Lehre von der Gemeinde für die Gemeinde.* [Elaborate and diffuse, attempting to retain and combine as many interpretations as possible, yet exceedingly valuable.—R.]—MATTHIES: *Erklärung des Briefs Pauli an die Epheser,* 1834.—[HOLZHAUSEN: *Der Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Epheser übersetzt und erklärt,* 1833].

The following should be compared: LUENEMANN: *De epistola, quam Paulus ad Ephes. dedisse perhibetur, authentica,* 1842.—KLÖPPER: *De origine epp. ad Ephes. et Col.,* 1853.—J. P. LANGE: *Geschichte der Kirche,* I. 1, p. 117 ff.—[W. F. RINCK: *Disput. ad authentiam epist. P. ad Ephes. probandam,* 1848.—Also the histories of the Apostolic times by REUSS, LECHLER, THIERSCH, SCHAFF, *etc.*—R.]

For practical exegesis we name: CHRYSOSTOM: 2d Homilies on our Epistle.—SPENER: *Erklärung der Episteln an die Epheser und Kolosser,* 1730.—RIEGER: *Betrachtungen über das N. Testament, Theil* 3, 1833.—[PASSAVANT: *Versuch einer praktischen Auslegung des Briefes Pauli an die Ephesier.* Basle, 1836]. HEUBNER: *Praktische Erklärung des N. Testaments,* Band 4, 1859.—KAEHLER: *Auslegung der Epistel Pauli an die Epheser in* 34 *Predigten.*—On Eph. vi. 1-9, AHLFELD: *Der Christliche Hausstand,* 1851.

[Comp. the lists in the Introduction to the New Testament, *Biblework,* Matthew, p. 19, in the Introduction to the Pauline Epistles, Romans, pp. 27 f., 48 ff.—Of special value here are the commentaries of CALVIN, BENGEL, MEYER, ALFORD (the 4th edition has been used in preparing the additions), WORDSWORTH. Among the earliest English works on this Epistle we mention: PAUL BAYNE, London, 1643; GOODWIN, London, 1681: BOYD, London, 1652 (in Latin); ROLLOCK, Geneva, 1593 (in Latin also).—Later works—EADIE: *A commentary on the Greek text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians,* London, 1853; 2d edition, 1861. (Full, devout, generally accurate, containing a good list of the literature on the Epistle, and abounding in practical remarks which have been largely used in the Homiletical department).—TURNER: *The Epistle to the Ephesians in Greek and English,* New York, 1856.—HODGE: *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians,* New York, 1856 (republished in London, 1863).—C. J. ELLICOTT: *A critical and grammatical commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians,* London, 1855; 2d edition, 1859. The 4th edition (1868) has been used in preparing the volume. It differs but little from the 2d. (Without a rival in English for concise statement in the department of grammar, accompanied by a good translation, pervaded by a devout tone, and prepared with the greatest care).—J. LLEWELYN DAVIES: *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians, the Colossians and Philemon; with introduction and notes, and an essay on the traces of foreign elements in the theology of these Epistles,* London, 1866.—Eadie enumerates among the more popular works those of M'GHEE, LATHROP, EVANS, EASTBOURNE and PRIDHAM.—R.]

THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE EPHESIANS.*

I. ADDRESS AND SALUTATION.

Chapter I. 1, 2.

1 Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ[1] by the will of God, to the saints[2] which [who]
are at [in] Ephesus,[3] and to [omit to] the faithful [or believers] in Christ Jesus: [.]
2 Grace *be* to you, and peace, from God our Father, and *from* [omit *from*][4] the Lord
Jesus Christ.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

* Title: ℵ. A. B. D. E. K and others: πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, to which F. G. and others prefix ἄρχεται, some versions *incipit*. L. has τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Παύλου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους. [Elzevir has Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἡ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστολή, which is followed in the E. V.—R.]

[1] Ver. 1.—[*Rec.*, ℵ. A. F. G. K. L., all cursives, some versions, read: Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. B. D. E., some versions and fathers, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Ellicott, Alford: Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. The latter is more usual (see Col. i. 1) and seemingly better adapted to the contents of this Epistle, which would afford grounds for deciding against it. See in *Exeg. Notes*, Braune's reasons for accepting the first reading.—R.]

[2] Ver. 1.—[ℵ.[3] A. insert πᾶσιν after ἁγίοις. So Vulgate, Coptic.—R.]

[3] Ver. 1.—[See the *Introd.* § 5, for a discussion respecting the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. The words are found in all uncial and cursive manuscripts except ℵ. B. 67. They are found in *all* versions without exception. Meyer (p. 8) defends the words as *decidedly* genuine, and with him a number of the best editors. On the other hand, they are omitted in the three manuscripts mentioned above, though supplied by later hands in ℵ. B., and really present in 67, with marks of suspicion. To this must be added, the testimony of Basil that in his time they were wanting in old copies, Marcion's view, the possibility that Tertullian did not know of them, Origen's acceptance of the omission, and the bare possibility that Jerome did not insert them. The discovery of ℵ. and its omission of them has led careful editors, such as Tischendorf, Ellicott and Alford, to bracket them, but there is at present no evidence sufficient to warrant their rejection, while the omission makes a reading so singular as to overbear the ordinary canon respecting the *lectio difficilior*. We must also take into the account the "subjective criticism" of the earlier centuries.—R.]

[4] Ver. 2.—[Ellicott aptly says: "The preposition in such cases as this should certainly be omitted, as its insertion tends to make that unity of source from whence the grace and peace come less apparent than it is in the Greek." For the same reason a thorough revision would remove the comma after "Father," as well as the second "to" in ver. 1.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. *The Inscription* (address). A. *The writer* (ver. 1 a). **Paul.** Comp. the Introduction to the Epistle to the Romans. Beza (Acts xiii. 9) explains the fact that he thus names himself in all his Epistles, by saying that he as the Apostle to the Gentiles retains the appellation used by them. Jerome: "The name *Paul* is the token of victory, raised above the first spoils of the church among the heathen." [Comp. Schaff, *Romans*,* p. 58.]—**An apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God.**—We find precisely as here ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ in 2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1. While in the earliest Epistles to the Thessalonians there is no qualifying phrase, Paul calls himself in Philem. 1, δέσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, and writes in Phil. i. 1: Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος, δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ; in 1 Cor. i. 1 κλητός is prefixed, in Rom. i. 1 δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is added, in Tit. i. 1 δοῦλος θεοῦ, ἀπόστολος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ are joined together, while in 1 Tim. i. 1, instead of διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ, we find κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν. In Rom. i. 1; Gal. i. 1; Tit. i. 1, still further amplifications are appended. In this variety there is nothing arbitrary, but a consideration of the circumstances and relations determines the special form of the inscription in each letter, as in each case must be shown and has been shown. The shortest form, used here by the Apostle, is sufficient to indicate, humbly in unfading remembrance of his wonderful conversion and calling, that he has received his Apostleship without his own merit or worthiness, through the will and grace of the Most High (Gal. i. 15, 16), hence that he had not assumed it for himself or obtained it through the mediation of others. He did not present himself to the Ephesians as a stranger, as in the case of

* [Whenever the name of an Epistle or Gospel thus occurs, in Italics, followed by a reference to page or section, without any other specification, the reference is to the present edition of the "Biblework," or "Lange's Commentary," as it is popularly called.—R.]

the *Roman* church, nor had he to deal with opponents, as in the case of the *Galatians*, nor was he approaching the end of his life, as it appears in the *Pastoral Epistles*. Hence there was no need of such an amplification as in those letters. Still, as he was not writing about a private matter, as to *Philemon*, but of Church and Christianity at large, and the Epistle is an official letter of great importance, the official designation should not be omitted. Comp. the *Introduction*, § 1. 2, § 3.

Ἀπόστολος is an official title. [Comp. *Romans*, p. 59.] See Luke vi. 13 (ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν); Mark iii. 14: ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν. Hence 1 Tim. ii. 7: κῆρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος and πρεσβεύειν ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, 2 Cor. v. 20; Eph. vi. 20. As an Apostle, one sent out, he is dependent on the Sender, has his authority in Him (against HARLESS), since κατ' ἐπιταγὴν—Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, 1 Tim. i. 1, does not describe the source, the origin of the Apostolic authority, but only the *corresponding activity*, the *situation in accordance with* the commission. It is no self-glorification, but in ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ there is expressed the feeling of *dependence*, in κατ' ἐπιταγὴν—Ἰησοῦ that of *attachment;* thus in 2 Cor. iii. 5 he calls himself ἱκανός, "sufficient," but denies his ἱκανότης ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ; his "sufficiency is of God."

The genitive Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ accordingly designates chiefly Him who sends, who gives authority; the subject of the proclamation commanded to the Apostle is indeed the same Lord; but this lies in the nature and Being and position of the Sender, not in the genitive. Paul thus marks the authority which he has in the Christian church. [ELLICOTT and ALFORD follow HARLESS in taking the genitive as one of simple possession, but EADIE thinks it indicates also "the source, dignity and functions of the Apostolic commission," as well as including the idea of authority.—R.]

Finally, the position of the words must be considered. The best and most MSS. read here Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; the same order is found in Gal. i. 1 without variation, but in all other Pauline inscriptions Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ is the better attested reading, so that TISCHENDORF (ed. 7, maj.) reads thus in every case except Gal. i. 1, while KNAPP and others read Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, except in Philemon 1. The difference in position expresses a difference of shading in the view. "Jesus" is the personal name of Him who appeared in the form of a servant, referring chiefly to His humanity. "Christ" is the official name of the Mediator, referring to the Divinity of the Son mediating from eternity. Historically the *Apostolic* proclamation begins with the Jesus in the form of a servant, the Son of man, rising to the Christ, the Son of God, as He proved Himself to be. Thus it occurred in the revelation to Paul, whose question the Lord thus answered: "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest" (Acts ix. 5; xxvi. 15; xxii. 8); in the last passage "of Nazareth" is added. He refers back to this most pointedly in Gal. i. 1; hence in that passage the reading is Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ without variation. But for this very reason the prevalent designation of Paul as "an Apostle of Christ Jesus" is explicable: for the *exalted* Son of Man, the Christ, who had appeared in Jesus of Nazareth, had called him to be an Apostle, while He had called all the others in the form of a servant. There is, however, no perceptible reason in the church to which he writes, nor in the contents of the Epistle,* nor in the circumstances in which he writes, for giving prominence to this distinction or to the consciousness of it. Hence the better supported reading is the more to be accepted, since, the subsequent context (πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) might give occasion for substituting the more usual order.

Διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ sets forth the means, as in 1 Cor. i. 9: ὁ θεὸς δι' οὗ ἐκλήθητε; Gal. iv. 7: κληρόνομος διὰ θεοῦ (א. A. B. C.; F. G.: διὰ θεόν). In these cases the preposition διά with the genitive evidently stands in connection with the *causa principalis*, seeming to be entirely = παρά, ὑπό. So in Gal. i. 1, ἀπό and διά are definitely distinguished, and διά is there applied to Christ and also to God. FRITZSCHE's remark does not meet the case: *est autem hic usus ibi tantum admissus, ubi nullam sententiæ ambiguitatem crearet.* WINER (p. 355†) comes nearer, since διά does not designate the author as such, *i. e.*, as him *from* whom something proceeds, but chiefly as the person *through* whose endeavors or favor, *etc.*, something is imparted to some one. It is precisely the activity and efficacy of the Divine will over against the various difficulties which must be overcome and set aside, "the achieving and penetrating power, the energy" of the same, which is indicated. It does not rest nor repose, as if what comes, only came *hither from* Him or *out of* Him; He must be active, must further in the present. Hence this phrase is not merely a reference to the final and supreme ground and to the important prerogative of his calling, as one divinely authorized, in order to remove all suspicion of intrusion and unwarranted appearance or writing, but it is also a reminder of the continued energy of the free grace of God; what exalts and sustains him and what humbles him, he comprehends here in one; it is as much an expression of humility as of dignity. Here this added phrase has "still another peculiar meaning. For when an Apostle in the Holy Spirit begins to write an Epistle, he knows already with the first word, what will follow further; he has conceived and borne the whole, before he begins his greeting. If we read further, how in vers. 3–11 all the consolation of this Epistle is brought out of the revealed mystery of the gracious good pleasure and will of God, we can mark what the Apostle has already in mind: an Apostle and messenger through the will of God brings no other message than a glad one, the gospel of Redemption unto blessedness. Comp. Rom. i. 10, 11; xv. 29, 32. It is a counsel of grace creating joy and peace, this will of God, through which he also, who from Saul had become Paul, in his call to be an Apostle stands before all who should

* [The contents of the Epistle, especially its fundamental thoughts, seem to me to be strikingly in keeping with the order: "Christ Jesus," so much so as to awaken additional suspicion of an alteration to that form in MSS. of an early date.—R.]

† [The references in the original are to the 6th German edition of WINER, but they have been altered to conform to the 7th German edition, which is now the standard, and to whose pages the last American edition refers in a separate index.—R.]

believe on Jesus Christ unto eternal life, as an example of the mercy that saves sinners (1 Tim. i. 12–16)."—STIER. [ELLICOTT gives especial weight to the latter part of STIER's view, ALFORD to the former, while EADIE clings to the single notion of authority.—R.] Accordingly the remark of MELANCTHON, although accepted by most commentators, does not cover the case: *Vides, quanta cura fuerit Spiritui sancto certos nos reddere de verbo Dei, ut et secure crederemus et non aliud audiremus præter hoc verbum.*

B. *The recipients of the Epistle* (ver. 1 b).—**To the saints who are in Ephesus and the faithful [or believers] in Christ Jesus.**—Ἅγιοι is applied to Christians according to the analogy of the Hebrew קָדוֹשׁ (Exod. xix. 6; Deut. vii. 6; xiv. 2; 1 Pet. ii. 9) as those consecrated to God, as members of a sanctified fellowship, of the kingdom of God, of the Church of Christ. Although in the nature of the Christian communion there is not merely, the calling and destination but also the condition and furtherance of inward holiness, so that the latter are to be chiefly thought of in connection with an ἅγιος and can never be separated entirely from him, still they are not assumed in the word itself [HARLESS thus restricts it], so that this is not to be regarded as a moral peculiarity (ESTIUS, GROTIUS and others), nor does it express the call in the history of personal salvation and the moral destination, so as to mean: those called to holiness (SCHENKEL). If the former view includes too much, the latter includes too little. The principle of holiness has already come to them and even into them (LANGE); not merely is the goal of their calling held up before them, but the strength to attain to it is conceded and imparted (STIER). So that ἅγιος designates not merely a goal, a destination, but a *relation* into which the man is transferred and with which something is placed in himself.*

The inner side of this relation, the *demeanor* is here designated by πιστός, which means not merely faithful, reliable, but is also=πίσυνος (in any case from πείθω), πιστεύων, *believing*. Comp. PASSOW *sub voce*.† So that it is used, not only in contrast with ἄπιστος (Jno. xx. 27; 2 Cor. vi. 15), but without such a connection (Gal. iii. 9; 1 Tim. iv. 3; Tit. i. 6), even in the address (Col. i. 1). On this account it is not to be applied to *constantia in sanctimonia* (GROTIUS) or *perpetuitas in evangelica fide* (BAUMGARTEN). MATTHIES is as little justified in limiting πιστοί to the enlightened believing nature, and referring ἅγιοι to the sanctified affectionate walk, as is SCHENKEL in applying the latter to the *destination of the life* and the former to the *direction of the heart.* For πιστεύω is not merely a direction of the heart, but a living activity, the acceptance and appropriation of what is proffered together with the devotion of one's own person to the Giver of every perfect gift.

Καί joins πιστός with ἅγιος, as belonging together, like Col. i. 2, and thus are indicated the external relation established from above, and the demeanor of the church corresponding thereto, or "prominence is given both to the external relation and the internal condition of the Christian" (HARLESS). There is no ground for taking the conjunctive particle as epexegetical, as BEZA and others do, appealing to ii. 8; Gal. vi. 16. Although the absence of the article before πιστοῖς renders this admissible, it is decidedly opposed by the fact that the union of ἁγίοις and πιστοῖς is a description of the one church on its *objective* and *subjective* side, of the two important elements in the completion of the idea (BENGEL: *Dei est, sanctificare nos et asserere, nostrum, ex Dei munere credere*): the two notions do not cover the same ground, nor does one replace or explain the other; besides, Paul, least of all, would elevate the *subjective* above the *objective* element, and that too with an apparent exaltation of the Ephesian church, as though the *vocati* were all *fideles*. Because the article is wanting before πιστοῖς, it is not allowable to find indicated in the two words *two* different *grades* or *parts* of the church, as does STIER,* appealing to 1 Cor. i. 2, where he thinks three grades are referred to; and yet dropping "the thought of grades, which is but indistinctly present in the two words," he applies them to two parts, the first of which is thought of in the first part of the Epistle, the other in the second part. The acceptance of such a division would be grammatically inadmissible here (we should then read τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ τοῖς πιστοῖς), and a similar division of the matter of the Epistle is found in others also; should not then the churches to which they were written, have had these two parts just as in Ephesus, or should not Paul have so thought of them in the letters addressed to them? The distinction is artificial.

Both ideas are further defined: τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. The first marking the objective side of the church by a local qualification, the second, respecting its subjective side, by the life-sphere of faith; each is thus defined more closely according to its nature. On ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, see *Introduction*, § 5 [and *Textual Note* [3]]. Whether it is accepted or rejected makes little change in the sense of the words.—Τοῖς οὖσιν means those who are. In Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1; Phil. i. 1, ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ οὔσῃ or ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν stand in connection with a following statement of the place, as herewith ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. This justifies the presumption that here too it can mean only this; nor does the word admit of any other meaning. It is entirely inadmissible, to explain τοῖς οὖσιν without ἐν Ἐφέσῳ as meaning "actual" (*to the actually holy*); this would read: τοῖς ὄντως, BASIL (τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις

* [Dr. HODGE explains it: "Those who are cleansed by the blood of Christ, and by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, and thus separated from the world and consecrated to God." No doubt this describes the "saints," but it is too extensive a definition of the word as here used. EADIE opposes the restriction of HARLESS, but properly says: "The appellation ἅγιοι thus exhibits the Christian church in its normal aspect—a community of men self-devoted to God and His service." ELLICOTT has a valuable note on the word, agreeing with ALFORD, who says: "It is used here in its widest sense, as designating the members of Christ's visible Church, presumed to fulfil the conditions of that membership."—R.]

† [The classical meaning: *qui fidem præstant*, is accepted by ALFORD, but the particular and theological sense: *qui fidem habet*, is preferable here, and is adopted by HODGE, ELLICOTT, EADIE. The last author thinks the other meaning would require a simple dative after it, as Heb. iii. 2. See his notes for the authorities justifying this meaning in the N. T.—R.]

* [STIER accepts the meaning: *faithful*, which best accords with his peculiar view respecting the two grades in the church.—R.]

ἐπιστέλλων ὡς γνησίως ἡνωμένοις τῷ ὄντι δι' ἐπιγνώσεως—ὄντας αὐτοὺς—ὠνόμασεν) to the contrary notwithstanding. BENGEL, who does not accept *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*, renders: *qui præsto sunt*, referring to Acts xiii. 1; Rom. xiii. 1. But the passages cited, Acts xiii. 1: *κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν*, and Rom. xiii. 1: *αἱ δὲ οὖσαι ἐξουσίαι*, by the participle of *εἶναι* mark only present existence and validity (in the churches which are existing there at present, the powers ruling there at present), and BENGEL himself shortly before explains with more exactness: *qui sunt in omnibus iis locis, quo Tychicus cum hac epistola venit*, so that the participle has still a local reference. Such a reference must at all events be retained, and if *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* must be omitted, then there is a *lacuna*, either intentional on the part of the writer, as in the case of a circular letter, or occasioned by the transcribers.

Ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is joined to *πιστοῖς*. The connection with *ἐν* is not objectionable,* even though *πιστὸς ἐν* does not occur elsewhere; for in Col. i. 1: *πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ*, the phrase qualifies *ἀδελφοῖς;* so 1 Tim. i. 2: *γνησίῳ τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει*. But *πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ* is found in i. 15; Col. i. 4; Gal. iii. 26: *μετὰ πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, 1 Tim. i. 14; and *πιστεύειν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*, Mark i. 15. Since *ἐν* designates the element, the life-sphere, the principle, the *inmost* life-fellowship of the believer, it is not=*εἰς* (BAUMGARTEN), for it is not the object, aim or direction of the believer that is marked, but his activity and vitality.† Hence it is also not=*διὰ Χριστοῦ*, for the means are not here discussed, as SCHENKEL thinks, nor is it to be rendered: *fidem in Christo reponentibus* (MEYER), since in that case we should find *ἐπί* with the dative (WINER, p. 367). The position *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* must be noticed, since at the beginning we read *ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and so too in the greeting, ver. 2. "The proclamation of the messenger proceeds mainly from Jesus, preaching and proving that He is the Christ—but the faith of the saints rests mainly on the Christ, the Messiah, the giver of the gift of God, of eternal life (Rom. vi. 23). Comp. Col. i. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 5; i. 14, 15."—STIER. "In Christ" is in this Epistle the centre and heart-beat of the apostolic proclamation. Comp. vers. 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, *etc.* [See EADIE's remarks in *Homil. Notes*.—R.] This formula corresponds entirely to the phrases "in Adam," "in Abraham," referring to the efficient fellowship of life. The connection with *πιστοῖς* must be retained, the more since *ἁγίοις* has already an added qualification. It is true *ἐν Χριστῷ* might be joined with *ἁγίοις*, as in Phil. i. 1. But it does not result from this, that it belongs here not merely to *πιστοῖς*, but also to *ἁγίοις*, as SCHENKEL, HARLESS and others think; as if Paul had written: *τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ!*

* [ALFORD seems to reject this connection. In that case we must accept an elliptical construction: "The saints who are in Ephesus, the believers (who are) in Christ," or take the phrase as qualifying both adjectives; the objections to the latter will be found below.—R.]

† [ELLICOTT thus discriminates between *πιστὸς ἐν Χριστῷ* and *πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν*: "The latter involves a closer connection of the verb and the preposition, and points rather to an *act* of the will, while the former involves a closer connection of the preposition and the noun, and marks a *state* and condition."—R.]

One might say with the same reason, that *τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* belonged to *πιστοῖς*, since the believers also are there.

While Paul writes *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* in 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1; *ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις* Gal. i. 2; in Rom. i. 7; Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 2, he says: *τοῖς ἁγίοις*. In the former cases he has in view the unity comprehending the Christian persons, in the latter the persons standing in this unity: this form will, therefore, scarcely support the view, that it bears in itself a more confidential character. (SCHENKEL on Col. i. 2.) For the Romans were strangers to the Apostle, while the Colossians, Corinthians and Galatians were known and dear. Still less is there to be found in this difference an indication that he had founded the church in question or some one else.

Ver. 2. *The Salutation.* [On the Pauline salutations, see Dr. SCHAFF's note, *Romans*, p. 57.] **Grace be to you and peace.**—*Χάρις* has the same root as *χαίρω*, *χαρά*, *χάρμα* (joy), *χαρτός* (pleasant), from which also *carus*, *gratius*, *gratia*, *grates* are derived. It means favor, gracious character, loving, obliging devotion to another, such as that of a wife to the husband, the enjoyment of love. See PASSOW *sub voce*. The thought of the Scripture is aptly expressed by the German word *Gnade*, the original meaning of which may be perceived in the expression: *die Sonne geht zu Gnaden* (the sun goes down, goes under), *ein gnädiger Regen* (a rain that falls lightly and penetrates deeply). It is compounded of *ge*, with the signification of strengthening, multiplying (as in *Geräusch*, *Geschrei*, *etc.*), and *naden* (down, into the depths). *Gnade*, *grace*, is therefore condescending love and beneficent kindness of God, the Lord, condescending indeed from the heights of glory into the depths of darkness. Comp. KLING, 1 Cor. i. 3 (*Biblework*). [The English word *grace*, as will be seen from the etymological remark above, has the same root as the Greek word used here, and is its nearest possible equivalent in all its various meanings.—R.]

Εἰρήνη from *εἴρω* (to knit, to speak, according to PLATO, *Cratylus*, p. 398. D: *τὸ εἴρειν λέγειν ἐστί*, according to the analogy of *sero*, *sermo*, *sermonem nectere*) designates a union after separation, reconciliation after contest and quarrel, since then the speech is no longer against, but to and for each other, since then comes rest and joyousness, *παῤῥησία*. It is *Friede*, *peace*, because one is glad and free [*froh und frei*], the actual well-being, corresponding to the Hebrew שָׁלוֹם. [The meaning of the Hebrew word is aptly expressed thus: "Peace, plenty, and prosperity."—R.] First comes *χάρις*, *grace*, "that which is subjective in God and Christ, which the Apostle wishes to be directed and shown to his readers; the latter is the actual result, which is presented through the bestowal of grace" (MEYER on Rom. i. 7); grace is the ground of sanctification and of peace, peace is the goal of faith; the dative *ὑμῖν*, "to you," *viz.*, *ἁγίοις* and *πιστοῖς*, after *χάρις* indicates that "grace" first of all becomes their portion, and then "peace" becomes and remains theirs more and more. The thought will be best completed from 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Pet. i. 2,

where πληθυνθείη is added,* even if this word is not in the Apostle's mind; for as ἅγιοι and πιστοί they are already partakers of these, and in Christians there is a growth both of grace and peace.

From God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.—The preposition ἀπό designates the *coming hither*, without defining more closely the relation of that which comes to him from whom it comes, as is done by ἐκ and παρά, or denoting the activity of him from whom it comes, as in the case of ὑπό. On the further distinction between these prepositions, see WINER, pp. 342 f., 346 f. Here ἀπό therefore means simply *from*, governing both the genitives: θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν and κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Both grace and peace come from both God and Jesus Christ; in this then God and Jesus are alike. Still in 2 Cor. xiii. 13 Paul says: "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ," placing it before "the love of God." In the present passage the two are distinguished by closer qualifications. "Our Father" denotes the fatherhood of God; we rejoice as His children "by virtue of the adoption (ver. 5) attained through Christ." With the word "our" the Apostle includes *himself* and the readers, called "you" just before, and all Christians, in humble, sacred joy. Κυρίου without ἡμῶν denotes in general the Lordship of Christ; He is such as Creator (Col. i. 16; 1 Cor. viii. 6; comp. John i. 3), as Propitiator and Redeemer (Acts xx. 28), as the exalted Son of man (Phil. ii. 9-11); and such power as Lord He has from God the Father (i. 22; Matth. xxviii. 18) until the consummation of the plan of salvation (I Cor. xv. 24, 28), while He in His appearance as Messiah (Χριστός) has God as head (1 Cor. xi. 3) and is "God's" (1 Cor. iii. 23). Comp. HARLESS *in loco*. It is inconceivable how any can [as the Socinians], in opposition to the language and thought alike, make the genitive "Lord Jesus Christ" co-ordinate with "our," and thus dependent on "Father;" but what is not possible for those who are unwilling to perceive Christ in His Dignity above us, and us in our need below Him!

The importance of this benediction will be perceived from the constant repetition of it, even if in manifold forms. The briefest form is found in 1 Thess. i. 1: χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη; in Col. i. 2 we have: χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν; 2 Thess. i. 2: χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Then as here (i. 2) in Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2; Phil. i. 2; Philem. 3. In Gal. i. 3, ἡμῶν occurs after κυρίου, not after πατρός, and something further is appended, together with a doxology. Tit. i. 4: χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν. The greetings in the two Epistles to Timothy are the fullest: χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. "Mercy" enters between, to indicate the activity of "grace" towards this "peace."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Paul knows and feels himself to be *an Apostle of Jesus Christ*, quite as much as those who were *immediately* called and sent out by Jesus Himself. He too was called and ordained just as immediately in an *extraordinary* manner, as these in an *ordinary* way. On this account he adds, "by the will of God," excluding all human choice and self-will in his call. Hence he is not to be reckoned as the *thirteenth*, but as the *twelfth* chosen in the place of the traitor *Judas;* the election of *Matthias* (Acts i. 15–26), having been occasioned by Peter and consummated by the disciples *before* the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, is to be regarded as a work of haste and precipitancy. [On the other hand, see LECHLER, *Biblework, Acts*, p. 22. The question is discussed in the histories of the Apostolic times. "Paul never represents himself as one of the twelve, but seems rather to distinguish himself from them as one born out of due time, occupying a similar relation to the Gentile world, as the older apostles did to the Jewish." SCHAFF, *Hist. of the Apost. Church*, p. 513. The only practical use made of it in modern times has been in the interest of Prelacy, against the people's choice of ministers.—R.]

2. As Paul places himself upon an entire equality with the other Apostles, although he is pre-eminently the Apostle to the Gentiles (Acts ix. 15; xx. 21; xxvi. 17, 18; comp. LECHLER, *Biblework, Acts*, p. 171), he designates the *Apostolate* as unique in its character, in respect to the immediate call, as well as to its special position and mission in the incipient stages of the Christian Church. This refutes the error of the Irvingites, who believe in the re-appearance of actual Apostles and the re-establishment and renewal of the Apostolate in their churches (SCHENKEL, SCHMOLLER, on Gal. i. 2, *Biblework*). We must not, however, overlook the fact, that Paul in Phil. i. 1 calls himself in connection with Timothy only "the servant of Christ Jesus," and in Rom. i. 1, "servant of Jesus Christ," in Tit. i. 1, "servant of God," first, and then "Apostle;" thus giving priority in these passages to the general official name; including his assistant with himself in Phil. i. 1, while in the two Epistles to the Thessalonians he mentions these without any further qualification. In the Apostolate, as a specializing of the general service of the church, we must regard the general ecclesiastical office as conjoined, finding in the former the basis of all real church offices. It is in fact the historically first form of office in the church, unfolding itself further in the wider course of ecclesiastical development, according to the necessity of the congregation, in conformity with the gifts and tasks of the church. Thus the *diaconate* soon sprang up (Acts vi. 1-7), then other offices (Eph. iv. 11), especially that of "*presbyter*" in both Jewish and Gentile Christian churches. To this correspond the instructions and commissions imparted to the Apostles by the Lord Himself (Matth. xvi. 19; xviii. 18; xxviii. 19, 20, where the promise: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," is especially to be noted; Jno. xx. 21-23), which are still in force for the ministers of the word, and will be unto the end of the world. In addition, it may be remembered that the Apostle is writing to churches already existing, though in most cases founded by himself, so that he does not place himself with his office and ministry temporal in priority,

* [ELLICOTT and ALFORD supply εἴη, not ἔστω (MEYER), the optative being the more usual form, as is implied in the suggestion of Dr. BRAUNE.—R.]

nor as to his rank above the church, but works on and in her, as well as for her.

3. Paul regards the church from a double point of view, as *consecrated to God*, and *believing*. With the first term (ἅγιοι) he sets forth its *objective ground*, with the second (πιστοὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) its *subjective life;* the former marks the *Divine work of salvation*, the latter the *human acceptance and appropriation;* that indicates the *relation* of the church to God, this the *demeanor;* that defines their *worth* (dignity), this their *worthiness;* that is always *first*, impelling to the other, this is always second, having in the first its ground, impulse and power. In the objective factor, in God's arranging and ordering, there is constantly given the power, which will and can and should become efficient, even though only latent at times. Nothing is said respecting the degree and extent to which this power, given in connection with the assembly effected by God, has wrought and been successful in the whole body; from the first feeble beginnings on to the consummation, there are manifold, unmistakable gradations: fluctuations, too, and relapses of a very dubious character. But above the *appearance* in single churches and periods, the eternal and glorious basis must not be misunderstood; here Paul gives an important example to the Ephesians. The Christian must confess in humble gratitude that he is ἅγιος, and in assiduous obedience feel and show himself to be πιστὸς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

4. God, who has condescended and given Himself to us as a Father ("grace be unto you from God our Father") with His gifts ("peace"), stands together with Christ ("and the Lord Jesus Christ") toward us as Giver and Dispenser. It is the will of God, who has ordered all things ("by the will of God") to this end, constantly accomplishing His purpose actively through His creatures, inanimate as well as animate and personal, willing and unwilling, yes, resisting even. Accordingly the Lord sends His Apostles, remains together with the Father the constant source of all the benefits of salvation, aye, the element, the life-sphere for all the called and believing ones. Although it remains untouched here, in what relation the Lord Jesus stands to God the Father, it is still clear, that He needs no "grace" and "peace," but is, as the sending Lord and partaker of Divinity, highly exalted above us, and we are deep below Him, poor, wretched, without peace, needing Him, but yet the objects of His mercy, who should become partakers of God.

5. *Grace* and *peace* stand related to each other: in the former God condescends to man, in the latter man lifts himself to God. In *grace*, the Most High comes down into the depths of misery and sin; in *peace*, poor sinful man, taken up, reconciled, pacified, cleansed, draws nigh to his God and Father. Neither is complete at once, each has its development and history: *grace*, not merely forgiveness of sin, but deliverance, enlightening, sanctification, beatification, imparts ever more fully, penetrates ever deeper and wider, exalts ever more gloriously; *peace*, not merely rest, quiet, but union and harmony, strengthens more and more, grows and impels ever higher and more beautifully. This is indicated by the form of the benediction. The victory is decided; it will be followed up, improved, and that more completely—and all this by the *ethical* mode of *faith*, not an indefinite and general one, but the special definite faith in Christ Jesus, the living Mediator of all blessing and salvation.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Did God make out of Saul, the persecutor of the Church of Jesus Christ, Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ, then rejoice in humility and think that the same God who has made of thee a Christian, a joyous child of God, will help others to the same privilege; if He succeeded in doing this in your case, is it not even more likely to succeed in that of others?—Do not forget that in dealing with the Apostle of Jesus Christ, thou dealest with the will and work of God.—Take heed in thine office and calling, that thou standest there by the will of God.—Paul, so wonderfully led, so marvellously overcome and so highly favored, sees through all the defects, weaknesses, sins of his churches, their glory, the glory of the people of God, and their life of faith, however weak. Now then, do not starch thyself in thy precious office with proud ignoring of the worth of thy flock; rejoice in the worth of thy ministry, but at the same time in the church of thy Lord; do not depreciate the church of God because of human appearances or on account of individual members, however numerous, since thou dost claim respect for thy office despite thy sinful person. The dignity of the office and the calling is to be recognized, even if the person in office or called permits himself to become guilty of unworthiness.

What is specifically Christian is this, that thou, called and trained by the Father, inwardly deniest the natural Ego more and more entirely, for the sake of the one and unique person, Jesus Christ.—He who is never satisfied in his morality, but humbly strives and believes and hopes, is near to Christ and belongs to Christ. Christless morality, irreligious virtue, or, as it was more faithfully termed in the last century and still is in this, "godless" virtue, calling and thinking itself "free," has only the outward appearance, the garment, is really foolish pride. Thou canst be a broker or agent of morality, then thy part in it is usufructuary, but thou art no owner of it.—From the fact that thou art "holy," *i. e.*, consecrated to God, accepted by Him the Holy One, follows thy faith, which appropriates and believes what is Divine and holy, more and more inwardly to the internal personality. It is therefore not correct to say: Holiness proceeds from faith in Christ; hence Paul calls them believers, too. Nor is holiness merely the goal of Christian striving; he who has God and Christ, the Holy One, has holiness also; it is not put before us as a goal, far or near, but we, as Christians, are in it, as in an element, a sphere, that it may become ours, be in us, increasing and strengthening itself in us.—The *saint* consecrated to God (ἅγιος) says, first in the consciousness and confession of his faith, however: I am God's! The *believer* (πιστός) says: God is mine! But that we are God's always comes first, then that God is ours.—How well has Paul complemented the salutation of the Old Testament: *Peace be*

with you (Judges vi. 23; 1 Sam. xxv. 6, *etc.*), by adding or rather prefixing *grace*, which was not wanting in the Old Testament.

STARKE:—A minister of Christ, a teacher of the Gospel, must be installed by the will of God. Mark this, ye runners, who run of yourselves.—Where grace is, there is peace also, even though it be not felt by a believer in his state of conflict.—Since grace and peace come from Christ as well as from God the Father, Christ must be very God as is the Father.

RIEGER:—A believer is already a saint.—My God! I am Thine; therefore am I holy. Uphold me in faith on Christ Jesus!—The chief possession of the saints and believers is grace and peace. This is from the very first the life of their heart; this distributes to them their daily nourishment and strength, and with this, too, they are equipped even unto the end of their course.

HEUBNER:—The call of God to the ministry gives the proper joy in office.—The Apostolic benediction contains all that is worth wishing for.—SCHENKEL:—Neither the consummation of salvation nor the beginning of faith is to be found outside of fellowship with Christ.—Grace is the ground of our faith, peace the hope of our life.

STIER:—He whom the Lord admits among His called saints, has an inextinguishable spark of faith, that may bring him among the elect and faithful. And if there were left of the church only a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, a cottage in a vineyard, a well-nigh devastated, straitly besieged city, and the rest were as Sodom and Gomorrah—if instead of the Ephesus of the days of Paul and John, there remains only the miserable village of *Aja-soluk:* yet shall the besieged city of God remain His preserved city, until He Himself destroys it, and we would not regard His sacred people as rejected either in their dispersion or in their blindness.—Grace and peace, it is just this which is wanting to those who are away from Christ and without God in the world, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. Grace and peace, it is this which is ever more and more needful for those, who have obtained precious faith in the righteousness which our God and our Saviour Jesus Christ gives. In this double yet single word we have once more: what proceeds from God and what should be effected in us. The first ground of all holiness is the *grace* of the Eternal One, meeting and preventing us; the final goal of all fidelity in faith is complete peace or entire salvation.

[EADIE:—"In Christ Jesus." The faith of the Ephesian converts rested in Jesus, in calm and permanent repose. It was not a mere external dependence placed *on* Him, but it had convinced itself of His power and love, of His sympathy and merits; it not only knew the strength of His arm, it had also penetrated and felt the throbbing tenderness of His heart—it was therefore *in Him.*—"Grace."—As a wish expressed for the Ephesian church, it does not denote mercy in its general aspect, but that many-sided favor that comes in the form of hope to saints in despondency, of joy to them in sorrow, of patience to them in suffering, of victory to them under assault, and of final triumph to them in the hour of death.—"Peace."—A conscious possession of the Divine favor can alone create and sustain mental tranquility. To use an impressive figure of Scripture, the unsanctified heart resembles "the troubled sea," in constant uproar and agitation—dark, muddy and tempestuous; but the storm subsides, for a voice of power has cried, "Peace, be still," and there is "a great calm:" the lowering clouds are dispelled, and the azure sky smiles on its own reflection in the bosom of the quiet and glassy deep. The favor of God and the felt enjoyment of it, the Apostle wishes to the members of the Ephesian Church.—R.]

II. PART FIRST.

THE GLORY OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST.

CHAPTERS I.—III.

A. The ground and goal of the church.

CHAP. I. 3–23.

1. *Grateful praise of the decree of grace.*

(CHAP. I. 3–14.)

3 Blessed *be* the God and Father[1] of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath [omit hath][2]
blessed us with [ἐν, in] all spiritual blessings [blessing][3] in [the] heavenly *places* in
4 Christ: According [even] as he hath chosen [he chose] us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him [;] in
5 love: [omit the colon][4] Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children [unto
adoption] by [through] Jesus Christ to [unto] himself,[5] according to the good
6 pleasure of his will, To [Unto] the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath

7 made us accepted [which[6] he freely bestowed upon us] in the beloved: In whom
we have [the or our] redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins [our
8 transgressions],[7] according to the riches[8] of his grace; Wherein he hath abounded
9 [Which he made to abound] toward us in all wisdom and prudence; Having made
known unto [to] us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which
10 he hath [omit hath] purposed in himself: [,] That in [Unto][9] the dispensation of
the fulness of times he might gather together in one [to gather up together] all
things in Christ, both [omit both and supply the things][10] which are in heaven, and
11 [the things] which are on earth; *even* in him: [,] In whom also we have obtained
an [In whom we were also made his][11] inheritance, being [having been] predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel
12 of his own [omit own] will: That we should be to [unto] the praise of his glory, who
13 first trusted [we who have before hoped][12] in Christ [or the Christ]. In whom ye
also *trusted*, after that ye heard [In whom ye also, having heard][13] the word of
truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed [in whom
I say having also believed], ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise [the
14 Spirit of promise, the holy One], Which [Who][14] is the earnest of our inheritance
until [unto] the redemption of the [his] purchased possession, unto the praise of
his glory.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 3.—B. omits καὶ πατήρ, ℵ. inserts καὶ σωτῆρος [after κυρίου, to complete the well-known phrase], which is disapproved by the later reviser [ℵ.[3]].

[2] Ver. 3.—["The aorist here ought certainly to be maintained in translation, as the allusion is to the past act of redemption. The idiom of our language frequently interferes with the regular application of the rule, but it is still no less certain that the English preterite is the nearest equivalent of the Greek aorist." A slavish application of this rule has much marred the version of the *Amer. Bible Union*. This section presents a number of cases where the proper rendering of the Greek tense is a matter of some delicacy, though rarely of great difficulty.—R.]

[3] Ver. 3.—[The singular should be retained, as in the Genevan, Bishops', and Rhemish versions. Alford and Ellicott (following the Syriac version) render: *blessing of the Spirit*, but this is a correct interpretation rather than a translation. *With* (E. V.) need not be changed to *in*, but the English reader should be reminded that the Greek preposition is ἐν.—R.]

[4] Ver. 4.—[See *Exeg. Notes*.—R.]

[5] Ver. 5.—[*Unto adoption through Jesus Christ unto himself;* the variations from the E. V. are all necessary; *the adoption of children* is pleonastic; διά should, as a rule, be rendered *through*, and εἰς *unto*. *Himself* is to be retained, because, although the reading is not αὑτόν but αὐτόν, the reference is to God, and this will not appear if the simple pronoun *Him* is substituted. Ellicott's rendering is peculiar: *having foreordained us for adoption through Jesus Christ into Himself*. He justifies the last preposition by the English idiom "adopt into."—R.]

[6] Ver. 6.—ℵ. A. B. have ἧς, corrected in the first to ἐν ᾗ, as D. E. F. G. K. L. read; the former is, however, *lectio difficilior*, and it is more likely that the latter arose from it, than the reverse. [The reading of the *Rec.* (ἐν ᾗ) is found in a great majority of cursives, many versions and fathers; it is adopted by Tischendorf and Ellicott. The other is received by Lachmann, Meyer, Alford. It is very difficult to decide, but the above rendering is based on the reading ἧς.—R.]

[7] Ver. 7.—[The emphatic article τῶν before παραπτωμάτων is best rendered by the possessive pronoun *our*, as indeed is often necessary in translating the article from the German. *Transgressions* is more exact than *sins*, and thus the distinction between this verse and Col. i. 14 is maintained.—On τὴν before ἀπολύτρωσιν see *Exeg. Notes*.—R.]

[8] Ver. 7.—[Instead of τὸν πλοῦτον (*Rec.*, ℵ.[3] D.[3] K. L.) read τὸ πλοῦτος (ℵ.[1] A. B. D.[1]), which is adopted by Lachmann, Rückert, Tischendorf (see his *Prolegg.* p. lv. 7th ed.), Alford, Ellicott. Comp. Winer, p. 64.—R.]

[9] Ver. 10.—[Among the multitude of emendations suggested in regard to this part of ver. 10. I have felt that it was only necessary to adopt this one, which literally translates the preposition εἰς. The phrases, *for, with a view to, in regard of, with reference to*, are not more intelligible than the simple *unto*, providing the pointing be properly altered (as above) to indicate the close connection with "purposed." Ellicott omits even the comma.—*Dispensation* was once an improper translation, but is perhaps now the nearest equivalent to the Greek οἰκονομία; *fulfilment* might be substituted for *fulness*, and *seasons* for *times*, but the gain would be slight. The omission of *that* requires a change in the finite construction of the remainder of the verse.—R.]

[10] Ver 10.—[The τε after τα in the *Rec.* is to be rejected, having scarcely any support (ℵ.[3]). A much more difficult question is whether we should read ἐπι or ἐν before τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. For the first, which is very unusual in this connection, the authorities are: ℵ.[1] B. D. L. and 40 cursives, accepted by Lachmann. Rückert, Meyer. Alford and others; for the second (*Rec.*), A. F. G. K., majority of cursives. fathers, accepted by Griesbach, Scholz, Harless, De Wette, Tischendorf, Ellicott, Eadie, Braune. If the former be adopted, it must be as an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον; and is so remarkable a one, that we may well incline to the latter, especially as a careless copyist would find ἐπί so close at hand. Comp. *Exeg. Notes*.—R.]

[11] Ver. 11—ℵ. B. K. L. [all modern editors]: ἐκληρώθημεν. A. D. E. F. G.: ἐκλήθημεν, which is the easier reading. [Braune takes this verb to mean: *made an inheritance*, not *obtain an inheritance*, as in E. V.—R.]

[12] Ver. 12.—[For a justification of this translation now generally adopted, see *Exeg. Notes*.—R.]

[13] Ver. 13.—[This view of the construction is the simplest, and most defensible. The participles: ἀκούσαντες—πιστεύσαντες, are best rendered by the English past participles; *after that, etc.* (E. V.), is, too, pronounced in its temporal reference.—R.]

[14] Ver. 14.—ὅς according to ℵ. D. E. K. is *lectio difficilior* over against ὅ, A. B. F. [The latter is the reading of the *Rec.*, Lachmann, Rückert, Alford. The former is accepted by Tischendorf, Ellicott, Meyer, who remarks on the readiness with which the latter reading would arise, owing to the neuter πνεῦμα.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.—It is clear that ver. 3 *opens* the section with thanksgiving and praise for the blessing of Redemption. But in this wonderful chain of clauses (vers. 4-14), so interwoven and intertwined, the divisions and groupings are not easily perceived, so that expositors hold very different opinions. But it is evident, that the three times repeated: "unto the praise of the glory of his grace" (ver. 6), "unto the praise of his glory" (ver. 12), "unto the praise of his glory" (ver. 14), form conclusions, receiving, it

is true, in the flow of language in vers. 6 and 12, qualifications for amplification and transition. Accordingly we find in vers. 4-6, the *first* foundation for praise: *the election of eternal mercy;* in vers. 7-12, the *second: the carrying out of the eternal decree;* vers. 13, 14, the *third: the personal appropriation of salvation.* Our view is directed to the *Father* before all time, the *Son* in time, the *Spirit* in eternity. So STIER, who, however, artificially divides each section again into three parts, according to *ground, course* and *goal.*

[ALFORD, who follows STIER, gives this summary: "The preliminary *idea of the Church,* set forth in the form of an *ascription of praise,* vers. 3-14:—thus arranged: vers. 3-6, the *Father,* in His eternal love, has chosen us to holiness (ver. 4), ordained us to Sonship (ver. 5), bestowed grace on us in the Beloved; vers. 7-12, in the *Son,* we have—redemption according to the riches of His grace (ver. 7), knowledge of the mystery of His will (vers. 8, 9), inheritance under Him the one Head (vers. 10-12); vers. 13-14, through the *Spirit* we are sealed, by hearing the word of salvation (ver. 13), by receiving the earnest of our inheritance, to the redemption of the purchased possession (ver. 14).—Dr. HODGE is less satisfactory, see ver. 4 for his exhaustive analysis of vers. 4-6.—R.]

HARLESS: I. The objective act of God, *a*) in the eternal decree of the Redemption of believers, *b*) actualized through the death of His Son (1-7: *παραπτωμάτων*); II. The revelation of this act in the word (7–10); III. The subjective actualization of this act in the Redemption of individuals (11-14).—MEYER takes the salvation (ver. 3) as *a*) foreordained (vers. 4, 5), *b*) effected (vers. 6, 7), *c*) made known (vers. 8-10), *d*) actually appropriated (ver. 11), by Jews (ver. 12), as well as by those who had been heathen (vers. 13, 14).—Others otherwise, always with an overlooking of the incisa so readily perceived.—[Dr. LANGE, who suggests the frequent occurrence of liturgical forms in Paul's Epistles, finds in these verses the most striking example. See his liturgical reading. *Romans,* p. 26.—R.]

Ver. 3. *General opening.*

Blessed be [*ε ὐ λ ο γ η τ ό ς*].*—First of all, we must notice the play upon the words: *ε ὐ λ ο γ η τ ό ς—ὁ εὐλογήσας—ἐν—εὐλογία.* The words *εὐλογεῖν* and *εὐλογια* have a two-fold meaning, as in *benedicere* and *benedictio,* to bless and blessing, בָּרַךְ (בְּרֵךְ), to *praise,* to laud and to *endow,* all to be traced back to one sense, *to speak or promise good.* So *εὐλογεῖν,* Luke i. 64 (*ἐλάλει εὐλογῶν τὸν θεόν*); comp. xxiv. 53 (*αἰνοῦντες τὸν θεόν*): Jas. iii. 9 (*ἐν αὐτῇ εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν κυρίον*); *εὐλογία,* Rom. xvi. 18 (*διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας*), *decora oratio,* praise, Gal. iii. 8, 9, 14; Heb. vi. 7. The German word *Segen,* blessing, is derived from *signum,* sign, *i. e.,* the sign of the cross in pronouncing the blessing; from this is derived *segnen,* to bless (see JUETTING, *Bibl. Wörterbuch,* p. 171 ff.), and this means not only to wish well (Ps. x. 8; Isa. lxv. 16) in coming (1 Sam. xiii. 10) or in going (Acts xx. 1), but to praise, to thank (1 Cor. xiv. 16; x. 16) and also to assign or impart good or goods (Gen. xii. 2; xxvii. 34, 36). The meaning, to praise, to thank, does indeed become the prominent one, where it is applied to men with regard to God, since man has only words, can only *εὐ λέγειν;* as does that of allotting good or goods, where God's dealings towards men are in question, since with God there is no resting in words, His words are or become deeds. BENGEL: *Antanaclasis: aliter benedixit Deus nobis, aliter nos benedicimus illi.* THEODORET: *εἰδέναι προσήκει, ὡς εὐλογοῦντες μὲν οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὸν θεὸν λόγους αὐτῷ προσφέρουσι μόνους, ἔργῳ δὲ αὐτὸν εὐεργετῆσαι οὐ δύνανται, ὁ δέ θεὸς εὐλογῶν βεβαιοῖ τοὺς λόγους τῷ ἔργῳ καὶ παντοδαπὴν παρέχει φόραν ἀγαθῶν τοῖς εὐλογουμένοις.* It is otherwise, when Jethro says of God: בָּרוּךְ יְהוָה (Exod. xviii. 10), or Laban to Eliezer, (Gen. xxiv. 31): בְּרוּךְ יְהוָה "thou blessed of the Lord" (comp. xxvi. 29; Matth. xxv. 34, where Jesus as Judge will say to His own: "Come, ye blessed of my Father:" Luke i. 28, where Mary is called *κεχαριτωμένη,* "highly favored," in the same sense). Both meanings appear here in our passage, where the Apostle praises and blesses God (*ε ὐ λ ο γ η τ ό ς*), who has blessed us (*ὁ εὐλογήσας ἐν εὐλογίᾳ*).

The *form* here chosen should be noticed. *ε ὐ λ ο γ η τ ό ς,* which is always applied to God,* not *εὐλογημένος,* since for Him there is no time when He was not and will not hereafter be "blessed," so that God is *κατ' ἐξοχὴν ὁ ε ὐ λ ο γ η τ ό ς* (Mark xiv. 61). Nor is this=worthy of praise, to be praised, but like בָּרוּךְ in a purely passive sense, as the promiscuous use of both forms requires. The *position* of the words also, at the beginning, shows that the emphasis rests upon it: in Rom. ix. 5 the *Person* is put first for the same reason. [So ELLICOTT.] On the sense of *ε ὐ λ ο γ η τ ό ς* it may be remarked, that Paul begins nearly all his Epistles with praise and thanksgiving to God, and that too with a reference to the churches and persons to which, the circumstances in which, and the purpose with which, he is writing; with *εὐλογητός* as here, only in 2 Cor. i. 3 (so 1 Pet. i. 3), usually with *εὐχαριστεῖν,* Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 4; Phil. i. 3; Col. i. 3; 1 Thess. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 3; Philem. 4, with *χάριν ἔχειν,* 2 Tim. i. 3. As the received "grace" is returned again in thanksgiving, so is the *εὐλογία* received from the Lord, in the *εὐλογητός* from the praising creature: God is saluted, never blessed, with His own blessing (STIER).

The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—*ὁ θ ε ὸ ς κ α ὶ π α τ ὴ ρ τ ο ῦ κ υ ρ ί ο υ ἡ μ ῶ ν 'Ι η σ ο ῦ Χ ρ ι σ τ ο ῦ.*—Exactly as in 2 Cor. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3. Comp. Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. xi. 31; Col. i. 3; Rev. i. 6. It is most natural, since the passage does not read: *ὁ θεός, ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου,* to join the genitive *τ ο ῦ κ υ ρ ί ο υ,* "of our Lord," with *θεός,* "God," as well as with *πατήρ,* "Father" (JEROME, THEOPHYLACT, RUECK-

* [The verb is usually omitted in this and similar forms of doxology. "Understand *εἴη* (Job i. 21; Ps. cxii. 2) or *ἔστω* (2 Chron. ix. 8)." So ALFORD, ELLICOTT. It is from this word that Dr. LANGE derives his view respecting Paul's use of liturgical forms; comp. Rom. ix. 5; and the O. T. passages cited above.—R.]

* [This is true in N. T. usage. In the LXX. it is almost universally true, though in Gen. xxvi. 29; Deut. vii. 14; 1 Sam. xv. 13; xxv. 33 as ELLICOTT remarks, *εὐλογητός* is applied to man. The distinction is sufficiently marked to justify Dr. BRAUNE'S remark. See HARLESS *in loco.*—R.]

ERT, STIER), as the genitive is not necessarily required as an explanatory addition to πατήρ. It is found without any qualification, in ver. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 24: τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί; vi. 23; 2 Tim. i. 2; Gal. i. 1: θεοῦ πατρός; 1 Thess. i. 1: θεῷ πατρί. Besides in iii. 14 many MSS. read: τὸν πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (though ℵ. A. B. C. omit the genitive), while the established reading in i. 17 is: ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, so that the Apostle, as this very Epistle shows, could join this qualifying phrase to "God" as well as to "Father." On this account MEYER is incorrect, in applying the genitive to πατήρ, and not to θεός, on the ground that the former idea alone demands such complementing, and not the latter; nor should he have laid so great weight upon the notion, that the expression: *the God of Christ*, as an isolated one, has not obtained that currency, which it must have done, had it been found in this "solemn formula" also, since Christ's word on the cross (Matth. xxvii. 46: θεέ μου, θεέ μου) and on the day of His resurrection (John xx. 17: ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ θεόν μου καὶ θεὸν ὑμῶν; comp. Rev. ii. 7; iii. 12) suffice to justify this expression and this connection in our "solemn formula." We find too in B. the reading ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου, κ. τ. λ. Nor can it be asserted, with HARLESS, that if the following genitive belonged to the first substantive also, the reading should necessarily be: ὁ θεός τε καὶ πατήρ; MEYER refers very properly to 1 Pet. ii. 25. Καί binds what is homogeneous; τε adds something accessory (WINER, pp. 404, 408); *καὶ conjungit, τε adjungit*, as HERMANN says.* To be God and to be Father are not ideas which exclude each other, nor do they appear as two, but as a unity; He is here praised, who is not only the God of the Incarnate One, but is also the Father of this Lord, of the Only Begotten, whom He has given; thus is indicated the God-man by whom the blessings of Redemption are mediated. It was not necessary for THEODORET to say: δηλῶν, ὡς ἡμῶν μέν ἐστι θεὸς, τοῦ δὲ κυρίου ἡμῶν πατήρ. Practically this generally Christian formula has taken the place of the Jewish: the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, even if it were not so intended by the Apostle or Apostles, as RUECKERT supposes.

Who blessed us [ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς].—The active, over against the passive (εὐλογητός) denotes efficient, active blessing, the aorist the historical fact in the existence and condition of the Church.† Hence "us" should be taken in its wider meaning and applied to Christians, and should not be limited to the Apostle (KOPPE), who afterwards (ver. 15: ἐγώ) begins to speak of himself and his experiences, nor to the Jewish Christians, who are first thought of in ver. 11 (comp. ver. 13); so strong rather is the feeling of the fellowship under the blessing of God, that the Apostle, as the genuine Apostle to the Gentiles, includes with himself and the Apostles as his people, all men, who have become or will become Christians.

With all spiritual blessings, ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ.—This denotes the sphere into which He in blessing has transferred them; He has so placed us in blessing, that we are surrounded, overflowed thereby, and ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ. According to WINER (p. 105) this means *every* blessing; πᾶσα ἡ εὐλογία would be the *whole* blessing; see the instructive passage, Rom. iii. 19. There is no variety of blessing, which God has not bestowed upon us, but the entire fulness of the blessing, so that we have nothing more to receive, has not yet been conferred upon us. Comp. Rom. xv. 29: "in the fulness of the blessing of Christ."

The adjective "spiritual" limits the manifold variety to the domain of the spiritual, to what the Holy Spirit effects and imparts. It is recalled also in what follows respecting the adoption (ver. 5) the redemption and forgiveness of sins (ver. 7), the revelation (ver. 9) and thus is expounded the riches of that spiritual blessing, which we already possess, but which we ever need yet more. There is no manner of occasion for supposing an antithesis to the earthly blessings and promises of the Israelites (CHRYSOSTOM, GROTIUS and others), or to their typical possessions and the vain ones of the heathen (SCHÖTTGEN); nor should "spiritual" be explained as=*qui ad animum pertinet* (ERASMUS, ROSENMUELLER); our spirit of itself still belongs to the σάρξ. [See *Romans*, p. 234 f.]* The Apostle is treating of the blessings promised in Joel iii. 1, which are no longer merely promised, since their fulfilment is expressed in "who hath blessed us."

In heavenly places, ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.

1. Besides this passage the phrase is found in ver. 20; ii. 6; iii. 10; vi. 12, and in all, even in the last named, with a local sense; in the domain of the heavenly; hence in accordance with the nature of the matter, it is not to be taken in any coarse, sensuous signification as measurable, limitable space, but as domain, region.

2. The word itself has in the preposition ἐπί a local reference, like ἐπίγειος (1 Cor. xv. 40), but as this is to be distinguished from καταγειος, καταχθόνιος (Phil. ii. 10), so is the former from ὑπερουράνιος.

3. Τὰ ἐπουράνια at all events is not to be taken as=ὁ οὐρανός, οἱ οὐρανοί or=βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, but designates more indefinitely, in general, what belongs to heaven in contrast with what

* [MEYER's view: "God who is also the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," would require, if a strict construction be insisted on: ὁ θεός, ὁ καὶ πατήρ, as ALFORD intimates. ELLICOTT admits that there are no grammatical or doctrinal objections to the view defended above, but prefers the other, mainly on the ground that the phrase "the God of Christ" is singular. HODGE and EADIE join the genitive to both nouns.—R.]

† [EADIE at first took this aorist as marking "a customary or repeated act," an interpretation he seems to have given up in his 2d edition, where, however, a trace of it is found in a footnote which has no corresponding number in his text. To take it as having the sense of the present, which HODGE seems to favor (though his view would require the perfect in Greek), is untenable. The aorist participle, retaining as usual its aoristic force, "refers to the counsels of the Father as graciously completed in the Redemption."—R.]

* [ALFORD is fully justified in saying: "πνευματικός in the N. T. always implies the working of the Holy Spirit, never bearing merely our modern inaccurate sense of spiritual as opposed to bodily." HODGE apparently accepts both, which is not allowable, even if the correct meaning be given the greater prominence. EADIE concedes the latter meaning in the New Testament, but improperly in every passage cited. He justly opposes the exclusive reference of our passage to *charismata* (WHITBY), alluding to the transitory character of these gifts. THEODORET: "The blessings referred to here are, the hope of the resurrection, the promises of immortality, the kingdom of heaven in reversion, and the dignity of adoption."—R.]

belongs to and is on earth, as appears from vi. 12, where the contest with the powers of darkness "in heavenly places" is spoken of in antithesis to the contest with flesh and blood.

4. The connection of the phrase ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις with ἐν εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ is demanded by the fact that the latter is joined with εὐλογήσας and dependent on it, and hence the latter cannot belong to the verb as a closer qualification of the act of blessing. Accordingly this added phrase says, that every spiritual blessing, which we have received, springs from a higher world, is to be sought in a heavenly region and thence to be obtained. [ELLICOTT with his usual exactness presents the view here upheld and now generally received; he takes the phrase as "defining broadly and comprehensively the region and sphere where our true home is (Phil. iii. 20), where our hope is laid up (Col. i. 5), and whence the blessings of the Spirit, the ἡ δωρεὰ ἡ ἐπουράνιος (Heb. vi. 4) truly come." We may add from ALFORD: "Materially we are yet in the body: but in the Spirit, we are in heaven—only waiting for the redemption of the body to be entirely and literally there."—R.]

Accordingly it is incorrect:

a) To understand by *τὰ ἐπουράνια bona* not *loca*, with CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, LUTHER and many others; the idea of *possessions* is already found in εὐλογία (against RUECKERT, STIER). Nor is CALVIN right in saying: *Non multum refert, subaudias* LOCIS *an* BONIS; *tantum voluit indicare præstantiam gratiæ, quæ per Christum nobis confertur, quia scilicet non in mundo, sed in cœlo et vita æterna nos faciat bonos.*

b) GROTIUS is in error, in referring it, to a place indeed, but to the *cœlum summum* in contrast to the *regio astrifera.*

c) The rendering and explanation: *in heaven* (MEYER, RUECKERT, HARLESS, STIER, SCHENKEL and others), is not exact, passes beyond the word itself; still less is it admissible to refer it to the kingdom of heaven, the kingdom of heaven on earth, the church (ERNESTI, TELLER and others). [With more definiteness it is explained by HODGE: *cœlum gratiæ*, the kingdom of grace here on earth, the heavenly state into which the believer is introduced; a view to which EADIE inclines.—R.]

d) To follow BEZA in joining the phrase to God, is as unjustifiable and inadmissible, as to accept with KOPPE the aorist for the future, because the believers walk in heaven already in a certain sense (Phil. iii. 20, to which JEROME and BEZA refer), or *quia non in mundo, sed in cœlo et vita æterna nos faciat beatos* (CALVIN), or *quia hæc* (*dona*) *nos et spe et jure in cœlis collocant* (GROTIUS). The explanation of HOMBERG, that it is =εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ καὶ ἐπουρανίῳ is altogether arbitrary and groundless.

In Christ, ἐν Χριστῷ, indicates the mediation of the blessing (*Segnen*) which consists in spiritual blessing (*Segen*). Comp. 2 Cor. v. 18 f. It is not *propter Christum* (MORUS, FLATT, MEYER: "in Him was contained the ground why God blessed us," which is after all equivalent to: for Christ's sake). SCHENKEL: "Outside of the fellowship with the Son there is no part in the spiritual blessing of the Father (Rom. viii. 9 f.)." It cannot be overlooked in this Epistle, that this phrase: ἐν Χριστῷ, is "the centre and heart beat of the Apostle's view." It is repeated in ver. 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13 ff.; with the Apostle it stands in the same category as: in Adam, in Abraham. Herein (ἐν Χριστῷ) is to be found the difference between the Christian and Jewish Churches, the New Testament and Old Testament people of God. In the case of the former, the blessing was not wanting, nor the "spiritual," for the law is spiritual (Rom. vii. 14); even the "every" was not lacking, since God's Word was there, the forgiveness of sins, though in incipiency, in types, in shadow (Heb. viii. 5: σκιᾷ τῶν ἐπουρανίων, Col. ii. 17); nor yet is ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, "heavenly places," altogether new, as though the New Testament first found place and voice there, first established itself there, while the Old Testament pointed only to the earthly Canaan (against STIER).

[ALFORD follows Stier, in accepting a reference to the Trinity in the threefold ἐν, but ELLICOTT's treatment of the phrases seems more exact: "Εὐλογήσας contains the predication of *time* (Donaldson, *Gr.* § 574 sq.), ἐν π. εὐλογίᾳ πνευμ. the predication of *manner*, more exactly defined by the *local* predication ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, while ἐν Χριστῷ is that mystical predication which, as Stier well observes, 'is the very soul of this Epistle,' and involves all other conceptions in itself." This accords well with Braune's view, that it expresses the distinctively Christian character of the blessing here spoken of.—R.]

THE FIRST FOUNDATION OF THE PRAISE; VERS. 4–6:

The Election of eternal mercy. [DR. HODGE thus analyzes these verses: "Of these (spiritual gifts for which the Apostle blesses God) the first in order and the source of all the others is election, ver. 4. This election is 1. Of individuals. 2. In Christ. 3. It is from eternity. 4. It is to holiness, and to the dignity of sons of God. 5. It is founded on the sovereign pleasure of God (vers. 4, 5). 6. Its final object is the glory of God, or the manifestation of His grace, ver. 6." This agrees with Braune's view, except that he substitutes "the church" for "individuals" under (1), viewing the church as an organism made up of individuals. See below and also *Doctr. Note* 3.—R.]

Ver. 4. **Even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world** [καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου].—Καθώς marks a relation, indeed a conformity of two facts, which correspond to one another: the εὐλογεῖν has taken place in conformity with the ἐκλέγεσθαι; He has blessed entirely as He has decreed in the choosing, the election. So MEYER also. That analogy is in question, according to which from the fact of the blessing a conclusion may be drawn with respect to the election. It is not merely indicated that there is an internal connection between the election and the blessing, but it is definitely stated that this carrying out *corresponds* to the eternal decree of God. BENGEL: *electio respondet, et eam subsequitur, benedictio, et patefacit.* Hence καθώς is not used here as a designation of

causality (MORUS, RUECKERT) [HODGE: because], as it is in other passages (WINER, p. 417: [*quoniam*] *quippe, siquidem*); HARLESS takes it as an argumentative particle (=inasmuch) and says that it is related to *καθότι*, the latter however designating the *causa*, the former the *modus* (Rom. i. 28; 1 Cor. i. 6). [MEYER takes it as argumentative; ALFORD and ELLICOTT as explaining and expanding the foregoing, the latter admitting its causal force at times; EADIE is most exact: "These spiritual blessings are conferred on us, not merely because God chose us, but they are given in perfect harmony with His eternal purpose." However true it may be that "election is the cause or source of all subsequent benefits" (HODGE), it is hardly safe to found such a statement on the particle *καθώς*.—R.]

Ἐ ξ ε λ έ ξ α τ ο=*He chose us out for Himself;** Paul uses it only three times elsewhere (all in 1 Cor. i. 27, 28). The verb *ἐκλέγεσθαι* corresponds entirely to the Hebrew בָּחַר, as *ἐκλεκτός*=בָּחִיר. In the middle form it designates, both in the Old and New Testaments, an act of God, "by virtue of which some rather than others especially belong to God" (HARLESS). Although HOFMANN (*Schriftbeweis* I. p. 223 ff.) will only admit, that in this word respect is had to that on account of which one is chosen, or respect to him who on that account is chosen or accepted, and that the stress is laid each time upon that which the chosen one thus becomes, and not upon *the antithesis* to those who do not *become* this, yet he perceives in the preposition a *preference*, even if only a preference above a mass to which he would otherwise belong. He refers to *οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ ἄγγελοι* (1 Tim. v. 21), *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος* (Luke ix. 35), *ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός* (Luke xxiii. 35), remarking, that the angels are thus designated as taken by God into His service, and that Christ is not elected out of the sum of humanity, to become what the rest should not become, but chosen to be, what the rest are not. Ἐκλέγεσθαι, does then still mark a preference, a *distinction from* others, who *are* not what the chosen *are*, even if not an *opposition to* those, who do not *become* this.† Respecting the others, in preference to whom the elect belong to God, nothing is indicated here,—whether they are not chosen after all, or no longer do or can belong to the elect; just as it is not said concerning the elect, that they cannot fall away from such a relation to God. Since in 1 Pet. i. 1, the church is termed "elect" and in the conclusion (v. 13) "the Church at Babylon *elected together with you*," and "elect of God" (Col. iii. 12), "for the elect's sakes" (2 Tim. ii. 10), "God's elect" (Rom. viii. 33), etc., are applied to individual Christians, because and in so far as they are members of the Church of Christ, it may be concluded, that the act of election does not concern individuals as its immediate objects, as HOFMANN thinks. It is true that the *κόσμος*, out of which they are chosen (Jno. xv. 19), is not a sum of individuals, a *multitude;* it is rather an ethical conception. Still less is the Church a plurality, a *colluvies*, it is an organism, a whole. Yet God does have regard to the individuals, with Him the individual, the member, is not lost in the whole. Accordingly the explanation of HARLESS is to be sustained, only it must be remembered, that the *individuals* are not to be thought of as without connection, severed, by themselves alone, or the *others* as those who may not and shall not belong to God. HOFMANN's opposition is right only against this unjustifiable interpolation. It is evident that Paul could apply the word "chosen" only to himself and the members of the Church, because only in the case of these was this fact *cognizable*, and must be, or at least could be, *perceptible* to individuals. Hence we should here, with FRANK (*Theologie der Form. Con.* iv. p. 177), think of the world merely, out of which Christians are taken by virtue of their effectual calling, as in 1 Pet. i. 1; Jas. ii. 5; 1 Cor. i. 27 f., not however of the totality of those called, from whom the elect, as more numerous (Matt. xx. 16; xxii. 14), are to be distinguished. See further in *Doctr. Note* 3. Inadmissible, therefore, is the explanation: *præcipuo in nos amore Deus fuit*, because *ἐκλέγεσθαι* is also=*imprimis amare vel imprimis beneficiis ornare* (MORUS). Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 13. It is very erroneous to suppose (RUECKERT), that Paul transferred the faith of his nation, respecting the preference of their race to all the nations of the earth, to those who accepted Christianity with joy, and regarded these as the number chosen by God.

The position of the verb emphasizes this electing act of God as the main thing. It is then further defined.

First, there is added a designation of the *objects*, ἡ μ ᾶ ς, US. By this is meant the Church of Christ, the *congregatio sanctorum*, the "saints," who at the time make up the people of God, in whom the election, consummated in the calling, is perceptible and manifest. About the conduct of individuals, their faith, its degree or perfection, nothing is said, just as little as was expressed or indicated in *ἁγίοις* (ver. 1). Accordingly the reference is not to individuals in themselves, to the sum of individuals at that time, but to the Church and its growth externally and internally, yet in such a way that each individual may refer it to himself.* RICHTER, therefore, correctly remarks: "God chooses for Himself, out of all, *before* others and *for* others." But it

* [ALFORD prefers to render the verb: *selected*, as best indicating the middle sense, and the choosing *out of* the world. See ELLICOTT *in loco* on this word.—R.]

† [EADIE also discusses HOFMANN's view, which is simply this, that the election is only a choosing *for* and *unto* something, not a choosing *out of*. MEYER says most emphatically regarding HOFMANN's position: "This is impossible from the *notion* of the word. A reference to *others*, to whom the chosen ones would still have belonged without the ἐκλογή, the verb ἐκλέγεσθαι *always* has, and *as a logical necessity* must have it." How true this is, will appear from the unsatisfactory and confusing character of all attempts to explain away this reference.—R.]

* [EBRARD (*Christliche Dogmatik*, § 560) denies the individual reference in the verb ἐκλέγ.. but, as EADIE well remarks: "The choice of a multitude is simply the choice of each individual composing it. That multitude may be regarded as a unity by God, but to Him it is a unity of definite elements or members. On the Divine side the elect, whatever their number, are a unity, and are so described—πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέ μοι, John vi. 39; πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ, John xvii. 2—a totality viewed by Omniscience as one; but on the human side, the elect are the whole company of believers, but thus individualized—πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πιστεύων, John vi. 40." Paul says so distinctly that *God chose us out*, as to put men at their wits' end to make Him say anything else.—R.]

is also correct to say: *Sic nos quoque in Christo eramus, priusquam mundus fieret, vigore scilicet electionis æternæ* (MUSCULUS).

Second qualification: definition of *modality*, **in Him**, ἐν αὐτῷ, viz., Christ. By this our election is more closely defined and limited: Christ the Person, in whom we are chosen, the life-sphere, the life-element, in which we are the objects of the Divine election. HARLESS may be correct, in saying that it is first stated in what follows, how He has chosen us in Him, but he is incorrect in rejecting all closer definitions of expositors here as *interpolated*, even if they correspond with what follows. BEZA (*in ipso videlicet adoptandos*) is very near the true explanation, but his view is more limited than the subsequent context authorizes. Our union, our external and internal connection, with Christ is marked as the modality of our election. But the act of choice is asserted as a fact: in Him He has chosen us, so that as humanity was made in Adam, as the people of Israel was separated in Abraham, so the Church was chosen in Christ; not, however, that He has merely *determined* to choose us. Accordingly it is entirely improper to read ἐν ἀυτῷ (Alex., MORUS, HOLZHAUSEN), nor is it = εἰς Χριστόν (Ethiop. Vers.), or = δι' αὐτοῦ, τουτέστι δια τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν πίστεως (THEOPHYLACT and others), or *per Christum et Christi merita prævisa* (A-LAPIDE, BULLINGER), or *propter Christum* (GLASSIUS, FLATT). Finally, it is arbitrary and incorrect to join ἐν αὐτῷ with ἡμᾶς, since ὄντας is wanting and εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους follows.

[OLSHAUSEN, ELLICOTT: "In Christ, as the head and representative of spiritual, as Adam was the representative of natural humanity." "In the proper and final sense this can be said only of His faithful ones, His Church, who are incorporated in Him by the Spirit. But in any sense, all God's election is *in* HIM only" (ALFORD). HODGE: "In Christ, *i. e.*, as united to Him in the covenant of redemption;" on the ground of the federal union which precedes the actual union. So EADIE. MEYER is less exact: "The divine act of our election has in Christ its *determining ground*." "*Outside* this connection of the divine decree of election with Christ we would *not* be chosen; but *in Christ* there lay for God the *causa meritoria* of our election." This is really equivalent to *propter Christum*.—R.]

Third qualification: a *temporal* definition, **before the foundation of the world**, πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. Used by Paul only here, but found in John xvii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 20. In Matt. xxv. 34; Luke xi. 50; Heb. iii. 4: ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου; Matt. xiii. 35: ἀπὸ καταβολῆς. The preposition πρὸ denotes that the election took place before the creation, and, since καταβολή designates the foundation, the groundwork, before the beginning of the carrying out of the well-ordered plan of creation. Thus the reference to the eternity preceding time is made very strong,* stronger than in πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων (1 Cor. ii. 7; comp. 2 Tim. i. 9; Rom. xvi. 25; Col. i. 26; Eph. iii. 9, 11). The election precedes the creation: the fulfilment of the former is justified in creation and its history, in the history of the world. HARLESS: "The plainest parallel is 2 Tim. i. 9: 'who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.'" OLSHAUSEN (with STIER also) properly rejects the idea of a real, individual existence of believers before the creation in the Divine mind, but Christ's existence with the Father before the creation of the world is unmistakably indicated (STIER). BENGEL: *Hæc præsupponunt æternitatem filii Dei, namque filius, ante mundum factum erat objectum amoris paterni non futurum tantummodo, sed jam tum præsens*, John xvii. 5, 24. [ALFORD (after STIER): "How utterly irreconcilable pantheism is with this, God's election before laying the foundation of the world, of His people in His Son."—R.]

That we should be holy and without blame before him [εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ].—The infinitive εἶναι ἡμᾶς adds a supplement to the previous clause, to the phrase ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ in particular, and is to be taken as epexegetical (WINER, p. 298), giving prominence to the end, purpose and result of the election. The position of εἶναι marks the existence, the actualized reality aimed at in the pretemporal, eternal choice. Chap. iii. 4, 6 (ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ—εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη, κ. τ. λ.) is similar.

Whether we are to understand the then present realization, just begun, or the consummation, begun in the church militant, or the completed reality in the church triumphant, cannot be determined from the adjectives "holy and without blame," but must be found in the phrase κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ, "before Him." It is not necessary to write αὑτοῦ, with HARLESS, STIER and others. BENGEL has remarked (*App. ad Matt.* i. 21), and TISCHENDORF [*Præf. N. T.*, p. 58 f. ed. 7], corroborates it, that before αυτοῦ αυτῷ, αυτόν we constantly find ἀπ', ὑπ', μετ', ἐπ', κατ', never ἀφ', ὑφ', μεθ', ἐφ', καθ', so that in the New Testament the reflexive form αὑτοῦ is never used, but in its stead ἑαυτοῦ. Thus too it happens that αὐτός is referred in quick succession to different subjects, as Mark viii. 22; ix. 27–29 (WINER, pp. 141, 143*). From the Apostle's point of view αὐτοῦ is quite correct, and to be understood of God, even though ἐν αὐτῳ refers to Christ. To the phrase κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ corresponds the Hebrew לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, *coram Deo*. According to this we must accept a reference to the present life, and not to the Judgment. The context at all events gives no support for the reference to the Judgment, which He will hold at the end of days. The parallel passage, Col. i. 22: "to present holy and unblamable and unreprovable in His sight," as well as the "now" (ver. 21), and "if at least ye continue" (ver. 23) refer

* [ELLICOTT says that this phrase "here serves to define the archetypal character of the New Dispensation, and the wide gulf that separated the πρόθεσις πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων (2 Tim. i. 9) of God with respect to Christians, from His temporal ἐκλογή of the Jews."—R.]

* [The question respecting the use of αὑτοῦ is discussed on this page of WINER'S *Grammar*. The sweeping assertion that it is never used, is not accepted by WINER. It appears, however, that under the influence of GRIESBACH, this pointing became too frequent, the tendency now being against it. ELLICOTT says: "The distinction, however, between the proper use of these two forms cannot be rigorously defined."—R.]

definitely to the present state.* This is confirmed by a comparison with Jude 24: "to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy." We must evidently apply this to the Judgment before God in eternity, but the expression is modified in accordance with this meaning. Hence STIER is mistaken in regarding our passage as applicable "to the last flaming glance of the holy Judge, who can and will be the perfectly righteous and eternal beatifying God alone (Heb. xii. 23)." SCHENKEL too is not satisfied with the reminder that He is the knower of hearts, but refers to His great Judgment day.

[MEYER renders this phrase: *judice Deo*, in connection with his view of the forensic reference of the adjectives "holy and without blame." But the reference to sanctification is to be preferred, and hence if "before Him" does not refer to the last Judgment, it must mean: *vere, sincere* (BEZA, ELLICOTT; so EADIE). ALFORD: "In the deepest verity of our being, thoroughly penetrated by the Spirit of holiness, bearing His searching eye; but at the same time implying an especial nearness to His presence and dearness to Him—and bearing a foretaste of the time when the elect shall be *ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρονοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ*, Rev. vii. 15."—R.]

With our view then "holy and unblamable" cannot of course mean the complete holiness, which is the original end of the first choosing, as its attained goal before the throne of God, as STIER thinks, or humanity cleansed from all the defilements of sin, which, according to SCHENKEL, is the end of the Divine election. Ἅγιος, *holy*, can scarcely be taken in any other sense than that of ver. 1, designating one consecrated to God. The distinction between its meaning here and ver. 1 is to be found in the qualifications: *εἶναι—κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ*. This state of consecration is therefore a reality, not merely a being "called," a "name" (although even this latter is not a mere sound, a non-entity), a reality too before God, and not merely before men. Accordingly *ἅγιος* here must in some way mark the internal effects upon the subject, connected with this state of consecration; so that *ἄμωμος* is very naturally added.

Ἄμωμος corresponds to the Hebrew תָּמִים, *unblemished*, and is to be rendered neither *irreprehensus* (MORUS) nor *irreprehensibilis* (2 Pet. iii. 14; Phil. ii. 15, where the form is *ἀμώμητος*), even though this is the original meaning (PASSOW *sub voce*). It is applied strictly to the sacrificial animal (1 Pet. i. 19) which is also consecrated to God.† The two words are joined together elsewhere (v. 27; Col. i. 22); in the first passage they are used of the church ("not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing"), in the latter, which is parallel to our verse, *καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους* is added. Hence we are reminded of Rom. viii. 33: "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth," and have to do with those who are transferred *εἰς υἱοθεσίαν* (ver. 5), who are partakers of "redemption," "the forgiveness of sins" (ver. 7), among whom all this is inward, living truth, the vital beginning of a glorious conclusion, so that advance is ever made toward holiness (1 Pet. i. 15, 16), and the saying in the Apocalypse (xxii. 11) is verified: "he that is holy, let him be holy still," which indeed finds a further verification in eternity. Thus both a condition, a subjective state, and more especially a *position*, which is to be and has been occupied, *a station* into which they have come and live, are meant, and not merely a *judgment*. The words of KOPPE, which HARLESS recalls, are apt: *non tum ad virtutis studium, quam potius ad dignitatem Christianorum, qua tanquam homines innocentes sibique curos Deus eos tractat, est referendum, idem quod alias in epp. Pauli est δικαιοῦσθαι παρὰ θεῷ*. Accordingly *ἅγιος* without further qualification does not refer to inward, actual sanctification (STIER). Such limitations as: *nisi confecto nostro stadio* (CALOV.), *quantum quidem hujus in mortali vita per Dei ipsius gratiam et carnis nostræ infirmitatem fieri potest* (CALIXTUS), are as inadmissible as the explanation of BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS, that the final end of the matter of Christianity is found in moral worth, or RUECKERT's opinion, that it was the Apostle's peculiarity, to idealize everything.

[Modern English commentators accept the distinction of MEYER respecting these two words: the first presents the *positive*, the second the *negative* side; but there is an unusual agreement among them against the reference to justification, which BRAUNE, MEYER, OLSHAUSEN, HARLESS, KOPPE and others favor. CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT, CALVIN, STIER, HODGE, EADIE, ELLICOTT, ALFORD and others, apply the adjectives to sanctification. And with good reason: For an ultimate *result* is here spoken of, and Paul who had stamped the technical sense on so many Greek words before this Epistle was written, would have made the other meaning plain by using such words here. Dr. HODGE deduces very properly these statements: "If men are chosen to be holy, they cannot be chosen because they are holy." "Holiness is the only evidence of election."—R.]

In love, *ἐν ἀγάπῃ*.—Of course, His, God's love. This phrase, at the close of ver. 4, must be connected grammatically with the following participle, thus standing in emphatic position. The Greek is much freer in the position of words than the German; where the latter must help out the meaning with particles, the former requires only change of position; still it never goes beyond bounds in this respect. It cannot be connected with "chose" (OECUMEN., THOMAS, FLACIUS, BAUMGARTEN, FLATT, and others), since it stands entirely too far and too decidedly removed from that verb; and must be regarded as "trailing after it." Nor yet is the connection with "holy and blameless" (AMBROSIASTER, ERASMUS, LUTHER, CALVIN, BEZA, GROTIUS [*evangelii, τὸ πᾶν* is in love]. WOLF, RUECKERT [dubiously], MORUS, MATTHIES, HEUBNER [E. V., ALFORD, HODGE], admissible; although *ἄμωμος ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει* (Jude 24) and *ἀμώμητος ἐν εἰρήνῃ* (2 Pet. iii. 14) occur, yet it is in such close union as to form one idea; the phrase could be separated from its adjective by "before Him," only in case the latter were adopted to be in-

* [Dr. BRAUNE seems to refer Col. i. 22 to the future Judgment, in his notes on that passage.—R.]

† [" As there is here no sacrificial allusion, direct or indirect (comp. chap. v. 27), it seems best to retain the simple etymological meaning: *inculpatus*" (ELLICOTT).—R.]

cluded with the adjective as one idea, which was to be qualified; but Paul uses ἅγιος καὶ ἄμωμος without any qualification (ver. 27; Col. i. 22), and the proper exposition excludes this connection, which has mainly subserved the Romanist and Rationalistic view. Accordingly most (from the *Peshito* to TISCHENDORF) have upheld the conection with προορίσας as the only admissible one.

[The connection with the adjectives favors the reference to sanctification in those words, giving this sense: we are chosen to be placed "in a state of moral excellence which consists in love" (HODGE). But this author is as little justified in saying that the reference to sacrificial purification occasioned the connection with the following participle, as BRAUNE is, in affirming that the connection with the adjectives has mainly subserved the Romanist and Rationalistic view. Neither of these statements affect the question. ALFORD has an able defence of the ordinary connection. Besides arguing that throughout this long sentence the verbs and particle precede their qualifying clauses, since the verbs are emphatic, giving prominence to God's act, not His attribute, he holds that this qualification is highly appropriate: "ἀγάπῃ, that which man lost at the Fall, but which God is, and to which God restores man by redemption, is the great element in which, as their abode and breathing-place, all Christian graces subsist, and in which, emphatically, all perfection before God must be found." All which is true, but not sufficient to overcome the grammatical objections to this view. Dr. HODGE says that "predestinated" has a subsequent qualification, hence it would be tautological to join "in love," to it, but as ELLICOTT intimates, the two qualifying phrases point to two different attributes; one to the loving mercy, the other to the sovereign power of God. The view of BRAUNE, is that of the *Peshito*, CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, THEOPHYLACT, AUGUSTINE, JEROME, BENGEL, KOPPE, STORR, HARLESS, DE WETTE, OLSHAUSEN, HOLZHAUSEN, STIER, TURNER, EADIE, ELLICOTT, MEYER, BLEEK; also GRIESBACH, SCHOLZ, LACHMANN, TISCHENDORF. The list might be enlarged, but is long enough to sustain the last remark of BRAUNE against HODGE's assertion that "the majority of commentators adopt the construction followed by our translators."—R.]

Ver. 5. In love **having predestinated us** [προορίσας ἡμᾶς].—Προορίζειν, to determine beforehand; πρὸ points out, that the determination existed before the thing or person to be destined, and is to be more closely defined only by the context: "before the foundation of the world" (HARLESS, STIER, MEYER, and others), hence beforehand, not before others (BAUMGARTEN). The participle is associated with ἐξελέξατο: ἐξελέξατο τῷ προορίσαι, or καὶ προώρισε. Thus the Greek expresses it, not indicating a chronological sequence; the temporal relation is not touched upon. The aorist indeed denotes the concluded action without reference to the past or present; the matter spoken of is before time. Similarly vers. 8, 11, 13, 20. The participle denotes, therefore, not priority of fact, but only the attendant manner (HARLESS). HOMBERG is incorrect: *postquam nos prædestinavit adoptandos, elegit etiam nos, ut simus sancti.* In that case we should have found at all events, πρότερον προορίσας. When the Apostle says (Rom. viii. 30): "whom he did predestinate, them he also called," without mentioning the election, we must find the latter included in the first ante-temporal act, not in the other act of accomplishment, taking place in time. Nor can it be inferred from Rom. viii. 29: "whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate," that the predestination was preceded *temporally* by a particular act, that of foreknowing, quite as little as the two notions are to be confounded.

[As regards the relation of priority, ALFORD and STIER, take the "election" as antecedent to the "predestination," the former regarding the ἐξελέξατο in this passage as ranking with the προέγνω in Rom. viii. 29. On the other hand HODGE implies just the reverse, that the election is based on the preceding predestination. ELLICOTT too regards the participle "as *temporal*, not modal, and its action as *prior to*, not synonymous with, that of ἐξελέξατο." He takes it as=*quum prædestinavit*, "after He had," &c., but MEYER says that "*predestinatio* is never elsewhere distinguished from *electio*, as antecedent to it." EADIE too takes the participle as synchronous with the verb, which is safest where there is no grammatical necessity for insisting on the temporal qualification (see, however, WINER, p. 321). It is not well to dogmatize about the order in the Divine mind, especially on so slender a basis as that afforded by the Greek aorist participle.—R.]

The phrase "in love," coming first, marks with special emphasis the motive of the predestination. *In hac epistola regnat τὸ amo, amor, amatus; ipsi principio epistolæ congruit* (BENGEL). This precedence is like iii. 18: ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐῤῥιζωμένοι. What is thus demanded by the thought, and confirmed by the form of language, is certainly not contradicted, as will appear, by what follows: κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν—εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος, which is not added tautologically, as some (MATTHIES and others) suppose.

Ἡμᾶς, "us," is the object, as in ver. 4; but it must be noticed, that we have here, not ἐκκλησία or some such collective notion, but ἡμᾶς. Hence it cannot be said with SCHENKEL: "The *predestination* applies to the whole of the Divine decree of salvation, the *election* to the *individual persons* in whom it is accomplished." So much only is correct, that the thought does not respect individuals as such, a *colluvies*, a *multitudo*, but the church and its members, or the individuals as members of an organism, but in the predestination, just as in the election (ver. 4). Comp. Rom. viii. 29 f. [EADIE makes a far better distinction between προορίσας and ἐξελέξατο: "The end pre-appointed—πρό, is implied in the one; the mass out of which the choice is made—ἐκ, is glanced at by the other." So ELLICOTT.—R.]

Unto adoption, εἰς υἱοθεσίαν. This designates, in distinction from τεκνογονία (1 Tim. ii. 15), *adoption* (υἱοὺς θέσθαι, υἱὸν θετὸν ποιεῖσθαι); we are not children by nature, like Christ, but only by grace. *Adoption* is a rich conception, not at all a simple matter, and its actualization has a very significant history; it did not come to maturity at once, but has a development from primary stages, preceded by grand preparatory

stages, unto its completion in eternity. To the Old Testament Israel belonged the adoption (Rom. ix. 4, to which are added the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the service of the sanctuary, the promises); even the Christians are "waiting for the adoption, the redemption of the body" (Rom. viii. 23). An explanatory parallel to our verse is found in Rom. viii. 29: "He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren;" ver. 30 ("he also glorified") however points yet deeper, so that we must recall the bold words of Peter (2 Pet. i. 4): "that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature," as well as those of Paul (Rom. viii. 17): "If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ." Comp. Gal. iv. 5-7; 1 Thes. ii. 12; 2 Thes. ii. 14; 1 Jno. iii. 2. Hence it is not a *formula solemnis ad Christianam religionem adducere* (KOPPE), nor to be referred in general and indefinitely to the benefits, which distinguish Christians from other men (FLATT), nor yet *futura beatitate ornari, adeo amari Deumque redamare* (MORUS), nor can it be said: *υἱοθεσία veniæ peccatorum morte Christi partæ certa spe verissime constat* (TITTMANN).

[HODGE: Sonship in reference to God includes,—1. Participation of His nature or conformity to His image. 2. The enjoyment of His favor, or being the special objects of His love. 3. Heirship, or a participation of the glory and blessedness of God. Sometimes one and sometimes another of these ideas is the most prominent. In the present case it is the second and third." MEYER has a good note *in loco* on *υἱοθεσία*.—R.]

Through Jesus Christ unto himself, *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτόν*.—Against the reading *αὑτόν*, see the close of ver. 4. *Διά* with the genitive retains the meaning *per*, through, marking the mediator, cannot therefore be: *propter* (MOLDENHAUER). Comp. John xiv. 6. The person of the Lord must be regarded as that of the mediator. Even though we find in Gal. iii. 26: *υἱοὶ διὰ τῆς πίστεως*, there the subjective mediation which proceeds from the Object of faith, the mediator, is marked, here the objective, to which the former will not be wanting. We take *αὐτόν* as referring to God; should Jesus Christ be meant, the reading must be, *καὶ εἰς αὐτόν*. Hence the explanation is incorrect: *in conformitatem ejus (Christi) per fidem et bonos mores* (ANSELM and others). But the preposition *εἰς* must retain the sense *unto* or *into* Him, as is required by those passages cited in the last paragraph, which indicate the final end of the *υἱοθεσία*. Hence it is not so much an "explanatory addition" (HARLESS), as an adjoined supplement (STIER). The explanation: *ad gloriam gratiæ suæ* (PISCATOR, MORUS), is in any case insufficient. It is impossible to take *εἰς αὐτόν* as= the Hebrew לוֹ, *sibi* (GROTIUS, WOLF, KOPPE following the paraphrase of BUCER: *Qui prædestinavit pridem nos, ut in filios sibi per Jesum Christum—adoptaret*). PASSAVANT weakens it into: up to God. Nor is it=*ἐν ἑαυτῷ* (CALVIN, BEZA, CALIXTUS); and just as little a circumlocution for the genitive *αὐτοῦ*, qualifying *υἱοθεσία* (RUECKERT). MEYER is excellent: "How rich and entirely Grecian Paul is precisely in his prepositional expressions, by which he *never* represents a mere relation of case."

[Among the various opinions respecting *εἰς αὐτόν*, and the shadings of signification attached to it, the view of ELLICOTT seems most satisfactory: "In these deeper theological passages the preposition seems to bear its primary (*εἰς=ἐνς* Donaldson, *Cratylus*, § 170) and most comprehensive sense of '*to* and *into*' (see Rost u. Palm. *Lex. s. v.*); the idea of *approach* (*τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀνάγουσαν*, Theophylact) being also blended with and heightened by that of *inward union;* comp. notes on Gal. iii. 27. We may thus paraphrase, 'God predestinated us to be adopted as His sons; and that adoption came to us through Christ, and was to lead us into, and unite us to God.'" —R.]

According to the good pleasure of his will, *κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ*.—*Εὐδοκία* can indeed mean good will, as in Luke ii. 14; Phil. i. 15; ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 11, or wish, *arbitrium*, or Matt. xi. 26; Luke x. 21. Here however it is equivalent to *βουλή*, ver. 11: *κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος*, and the sense is that what was ordained in love, He ordained according to (*κατά*) the determination of His will. As *ἐν ἀγάπῃ* (ver. 4) denotes the principle of the ordaining, *εὐδοκία* here cannot mean "good will." It is the substantive answering to *δοκεῖν* (frequentative from *δέχεσθαι*, Ion., *δέκεσθαι*), to seem good, as Acts xv. 22, 25, 28=*beneplacitum*, and is distinguished from *βουλή*, the inclinational * act of willing (while *ἐθέλειν* designates the ethical act), only in this, that it refers more to deliberation, choice. Comp. TITTMANN, *Syn.* I. p. 124 ff. Hence the interpretations of THEODORET (*ἡ ἐπ' εὐεργεσίᾳ βούλησις*), SUIDAS (from Theodoret *ad* Ps. v. 12; *τὸ ἀγαθὸν θέλημα*), BEZA (*benevolentia*), LUTHER, MORUS (*pro benevolo suo consilio*), HARLESS, (according to the kindness of His will), OLSHAUSEN, HEUBNER [EADIE, not MEYER as the German indicates,—R.] and others, are incorrect.

[The two meanings of *εὐδοκία* here under discussion are: 1. *beneplacitum*, mere good pleasure; 2. *benevolentia*. Undoubtedly in this case God's good pleasure was also His *benevolentia*, but to which does the Apostle here refer? The usage of the LXX. favors the latter meaning, but in the New Testament both occur. The context must decide. It favors meaning (1.), for (a) the idea of benevolence in the highest degree was already introduced as a qualification in *ἐν ἀγάπῃ*, admitting that the phrase is to be joined with this verse. (b) The phrases occurring afterwards in vers. 9, 11 point to this meaning, especially *βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ* (ver. 11). (c) The reference being to the actor exclusively and not to the objects of the action, this meaning brings them less into view (ELLICOTT, after DE WETTE). The proper safe-guard against the notion of bare arbitrary decree is found in *ἐν ἀγάπῃ*. So substantially but with an occasional tendency to press the sense too

* [Braune says: *dem gemüthlichen Akt des Wollens*, thus indicating his acceptance of Buttmann's distinction between *βούλομαι* and *ἐθέλω* (the former more an act of inclination, the latter of deliberation, choice). On this see ver. 11. The word *gemüthlich* has no English equivalent, so far as I am aware.—R.]

far, GROTIUS, ERASMUS, CALVIN, BENGEL, FLATT, RUECKERT, DE WETTE, MEYER ("the *free self-determination* independent of all human desert is here meant"), BLEEK, HODGE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT. Nor does this view make the ground for thanksgiving the less, as EADIE implies.—We accept *θέλημα* here in the simple sense of "will," reserving the discussion of its precise meaning for a subsequent page.—R.] The explanation of CHRYSOSTOM (*τὸ σφοδρὸν θέλημα, τὸ μετὰ ἐπιθυμίας θέλημα*) is to be rejected.

Ver. 6. **Unto the praise of the glory of his grace,** *εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ*.—*Εἰς ἔπαινον* points to the *υἱοὶ θετοί*, who now praise, as those who have been blessed by the sonship and heirship, and renders prominent, that God's ultimate aim is the blessedness of His creatures, of His Own. For *εἰς ἔπαινον* is to be taken in connection with *προορίσας εἰς υἱοθεσίαν—εἰς αὐτόν* as forming the conclusion; it reaches unto the praise from him who has been pardoned. The object of the praise is "the glory," but not glory in itself, or God's glory, but "of his grace" (*αὐτοῦ* not *αὑτοῦ*, see on ver. 4). *Χάρις* is *ἀγάπη*, the latter is however more general, the former more special, marking love, which condescends, like the German *Gnade* (see on ver. 2), or which acts upon *χαίρειν, χαρά*, making or being *χαριεῖς* (lovely). This then is, principally, the object of the praise, which lauds indeed the glory of the grace. This glory is the object of the praise, vers. 12, 14, where we find: *εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*. It is remarkable that the article is omitted here before *δόξης*; but *δόξα* is not the main idea, but *ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ*, and we should render (according to WINER, p. 179): To the praise of His glory in grace (*Gnadenherrlichkeit*), so that *δόξα τῆς χάριτος* forms one conception. Still it is altogether inadmissible to explain the genitive *δόξης* as a Hebraism for the adjective *ἔνδοξος*; Paul was acquainted with that adjective (v. 27; 1 Cor. iv. 10) and did not select it here. This is equally true, whether it be joined with *ἔπαινον*, as meaning: to glorious praise (GROTIUS, ESTIUS), or to *τῆς χάριτος*: to the praise of His glorious grace (LUTHER, BEZA, MORUS, KOPPE, FLATT, and others).

[MEYER: "The glorifying of the Divine love (which however is here designated, according to its definite peculiarity, as *grace*, because it concerns what is sinful, ii. 1 ff.) is the final *end*" of the Divine predestination. ELLICOTT: "As CHRYSOSTOM appears rightly to have felt, *δόξης* is a pure substantive, and serves to specify that peculiar *quality* or *attribute* of the *χάρις* which forms the subject of the praise."—R.]

Which he freely bestowed upon us [*ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς*].—On the attraction *ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν* for *ἥν*—according to the well-known expression *χάριν χαριτοῦν*, see WINER, p. 154, and the *Textual Note* [6]. Similar cases, iv. 1; 2 Cor. i. 4. *Χαριτοῦν* = *gratia aliquem afficere;* but *gratia* may be taken in the subjective or objective sense, so that this means either: He has made lovely, pleasing, or: He has dispensed grace, favor. The word occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in Luke i. 28 (the salutation of the angel to Mary: *χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη*, where either meaning may be accepted, or both combined (STIER *in loco.*) [The objective sense is certainly to be preferred in Luke i. 28; for to take the other view involves at least a quasi-support of very untenable dogmas. On the force of Greek verbs in *όω*, see EADIE, HARLESS, ELLICOTT.—R.] It also occurs in the LXX. (Sir. ix. 8; xviii. 17), and in the first sense. The reading *ἧς* supports the first view; the reading *ἐν ᾗ* the other. For the former was evidently accepted in the Syriac version, and aptly reproduced: *quam effudit super nos*, so that His grace has not remained and does not remain fruitless. So the *Vulgate: gratificavit.* CHRYSOSTOM: *οὐ μόνον ἁμαρτημάτων ἀπήλλαξεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπεράστους ἐποίησεν*; THEODORET, *Theophylact*, ŒCUMENIUS to the same effect. A-LAPIDE: *Gratiosos nos reddidit, scilicet gratiam suam nobis communicando et infundendo.* LUTHER: *Angenehm gemacht*, made pleasant. BEZA: *Gratis nos sibi acceptos reddidit;* so STIER and others. The second view is held by BENGEL (*gratia amplexus est*), BAUMGARTEN, KOPPE, FLATT, HARLESS, RUECKERT, SCHENKEL and others. At all events with the perspective reaching "unto the praise of the glory of His grace," we must not leave out of view the result of pardoning, the effect of the *χάρις* on the *χαριτωθέντες*, who become *χαρίεντες;* here, where the Apostle "closes his first circle of thought" (STIER), there is at the same time a reference to the goal aimed at from the pardon. Accordingly "us" applies not merely to Paul and his readers or contemporaries, but to all believers.

[The subjective sense may be involved, but the other seems decidedly preferable. ALFORD says the subjective meaning of *χάρις* does not seem to occur in the N. T., certainly not in St. Paul. He very properly argues for the other meaning, from the "indefinite aorist, referring to an act once past in Christ, not to an abiding state which He has brought about in us." Also from the context which is all of God's grace. So ELLICOTT, EADIE, MEYER, HODGE. The Romanist expositors find in the other sense a support for their doctrine of *justitia inhærens.*—R.]

In the beloved, *ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ*.—This contains a reference to *ἐχαρίτωσεν*. BENGEL aptly says: *Autonomasia, opportuna. Amor plus significat, quam gratia.* 1 Pet. ii. 10: *ubi de iis, qui misericordiam consecuti sunt, ea dicuntur, supra quæ ὁ ἠγαπημένος*, AMATUS *longe eminet; ἔλεος necessario præsupponit præviam miseriam, sed amor non item.* The *Beloved*, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, (Col. i. 13; Matt. iii. 17), by God the Father, not *ab omnibus* (PELAGIUS), is the Only Begotten, the Son of God by nature, Christ; He is the object of the love (*ἀγάπη*) of the Father, not needing *χάρις*, as we: only through the grace of God in Christ do we become objects of His love; as *χαριτωθέντες*. Accordingly this distinction is not to be made use of in favor of the second meaning of *ἐχαρίτωσεν*, as is done by HARLESS. The preposition *ἐν* must be retained as marking our fellowship with Christ, who is our life-sphere; hence it is not = *διὰ τόν, propter* (GROTIUS and others). We are rather reminded of the verse: *Vor dir sonst nichts gilt, als Dein eigen Bild.* [Before thee nothing passes current but thine own image.] In Him, the image of God, we have, not only objectively, but subjectively also, the grace, that we are well-pleasing to God.

[EADIE: "We, as adopted children, are indeed loved, but there is another, the Son, the own Beloved Son. It was not, therefore, affection craving indulgence, or eager for an object on which to expend itself, that led to our adoption. There was no void in His bosom, the loved One lay in it."—R.]

SECOND FOUNDATION OF THE PRAISE; VERS. 7–12. *The carrying out of the eternal decree.*

Ver. 7. **In whom we have the** [or **our**] **redemption through his blood** [*ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ*].—Comp. Col. i. 14. "We have," "the first present tense of the whole discourse, and very emphatic" (STIER). Hence it immediately follows *ἐν ᾧ*, "in whom." With this a new circle of thought begins, pointing to the already experienced accomplishment of the Divine eternal decree, even though just begun. The preposition *ἐν* is to be taken in its strict meaning: for only within the Person of the Beloved, Christ, are we in the possession and enjoyment of redemption. Christ's work is inseparable from His Person; we have redemption, not in His work *without* His Person, but *in* His Person, which with His work is a living unity (OLSHAUSEN). Hence it will not suffice to explain: in *fellowship* with Him (WINER, p. 364, note 7), while it is altogether incorrect to take it as = *διὰ ὅν, ἕνεκα οὗ* (FLATT, KOPPE), even though the phrase "through His blood" be adjoined, and the explanation be: *cujus morti cruentæ debeo;* so MORUS: *propter quem.* SCHENKEL appears to interpolate *per δι' οὗ* in his explanation: by means of the fellowship with Him through faith. [HODGE seems to have lost the force of the phrase, weakening it into, "*i. e.*, not in ourselves," and then taking "by his blood" as explanatory. ELLICOTT, EADIE, ALFORD all catch more or less of the true view so aptly expressed by OLSHAUSEN.—R.]

We are having! Believers, Christians are in possession of a property. The *possession* is marked, not the receiving, or having received; hence *ἔχειν* is not = *assecutum esse*, or *assequi.*

[EADIE is still better: "We are ever needing, and so are *ever having* it." The objective sense, *there is for us*, adopted by ALFORD, following HARLESS, underlies the expressed and emphatic subjective one; the latter is not merely "an implied import," but the prominent thought.—R.]

The subject treated of is a *bonum novi testamenti* (BENGEL)—*τὴν** *ἀπολύτρωσιν.* This word points to a redemption through ransom. This idea is a prevalent one, even in the New Testament, where our Lord so uses it (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45: to give His life a ransom for many), and Paul, 1 Tim. ii. 6: *ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*, Tit. ii. 14: *λυτροῦσθαι*, 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23; Gal. iii. 13: *ἀγοράζειν*, Acts xx. 28: *περιποιεῖσθαι.* Still the expiation, indicated in the Lord's saying, appears also, as in Rom. iii. 23–25. *Manifesto satis eam mortis vim indicat, quæ sacrificio confertur piaculari* (FRITZSCHE). Here indeed the thought of an expiatory sacrifice seems to be the prominent one, since "through his blood" is added (comp. Levit. xvii. 11, HARLESS). We may however take the blood of Christ as the ransom price. The powers and evils, indicated in the preposition *ἀπό*, from which believers are and shall be snatched, are according to STIER, the wrath to come (1 Thess. i. 10), the present evil world (Gal. i. 4), the power of darkness (Col. i. 13), all unrighteousness (Tit. ii. 14), vain conversation after the ways of their fathers (1 Pet. i. 18); indeed the *extirpation* and compensation of *all* the evil in which we have involved ourselves with our transgressions (PFENNINGER). Though the word may have in passages, such as iv. 30; Rom. viii. 23; 1 Cor. i. 30, a more general signification, the original reference being supplanted or obliterated, here this is marked by the context. HARLESS indeed is correct, in maintaining against Romanist expositors (such as A-LAPIDE), that it designates not merely a subjective condition; but he should not have based on the presence of the article the statement that abstract nouns without the article merely designate that the generic notion has become real as a subjective possession.

Through his blood, *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ.*—MEYER regards this as entirely like *ἐν τῷ αἵματι* (ii. 13), remarking that Paul was very fond of prepositional variations (2 Cor. iii. 11). The former, however, describes rather the mediation, which may be in constant movement, as here; while the latter points to an existing life-sphere or fact, in which indeed that mediation must be consummated. Hence the Apostle is not influenced by likings or beauty of diction, *etc.*, but by a shading of the thought.—In the Person of Christ as the Only Begotten, is given to us, as to all believers, Redemption by means of His blood, as an offering and ransom-price, and now we are having such a gift. Though Heb. ix. 12–14 is to be compared with our passage, still we may not introduce here, as is done by KOPPE, the sacrificial worship of the ancient nations, according to which through a sinless offering past sins were extirpated and the angered divinity reconciled, as though Paul had made use of this.

[ALFORD: "It is a noteworthy observation of HARLESS here, that the choice of the word, the *Blood* of Christ, is of itself a testimony to the idea of *expiation* having been in the writer's mind. Not the *death* of the victim, but its BLOOD, was the typical instrument of expiation. I may notice that in Phil. ii. 8, where Christ's *obedience*, not His atonement, is spoken of, there is no mention of His shedding His blood, only of the act of His Death." This was the price, *τὸ λύτρον.* As EADIE well says: "The *nexus* we may not be able to discover fully, but"—"the death of Christ has governmental relations, has an influence on our salvation totally different in nature and sphere of operation, from its subjective power in subduing the heart by the love which it presents, and the thrilling motives which it brings to bear upon it."—R.]

The forgiveness of our transgressions, *τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων.*—LUTHER joins this with the foregoing thus: *namely.*

* [The article here points to something well known; if the verb *ἔχομεν* has a reference mainly objective, then this means *the* redemption promised, etc., but if it be subjective, then it means *our* redemption. So CONYBEARE. ELLICOTT objects to this, but sanctions it in the Revision by Four Ang. Clergymen Such a rendering by no means implies that the *ἀπολύτρωσιν* is merely subjective.—R.]

the forgiveness of sins, thus taking it, and correctly, as epexegetical (WINER, p. 492). [So the E. V. in the parallel passage, Col. i. 14.—R.] This implies, that the more comprehensive expression, *redemption*, is to be limited, contains more than is involved in the context, *ἔχομεν*; "the forgiveness of transgressions" renders emphatically prominent one principal element, on which indeed another depends. Accordingly it cannot be said, that the Apostle defines the nature of the "redemption" with this epexegetical addition (HARLESS) [MEYER]. It is just as erroneous to extend the epexegetical phrase on account of the first expression, and to explain "forgiveness of transgressions" as taking away of sins (*Berlenb. Bible*). Paul *now takes out as chief the first thing:* the forgiveness of sins (STIER). FRITZSCHE aptly remarks (Rom. iii. 25) on the distinction between *πάρεσις* and *ἄφεσις*: * "*Conveniunt in hoc, quod sive illa, sive hæc tibi obtigerit nulla peccatorum tuorum ratio habetur; discrepant eo, quod hæc data facinorum tuorum pœnas nunquam pendes, illa concessa non diutius nullas peccatorum tuorum pœnas lues, quam ei in iis connivere placuerit, cui in delicta tua animadvertendi jus sit.*" Further the genitive of *τά παραπτώματα* refers only to individual facts, and, since these can neither be undone or extirpated, we must understand pardon alone; OLSHAUSEN is incorrect in laying no weight upon the form *παραπτώματα, ἁμαρτίαι* (Col. i. 14), and including also the sinful condition, the inborn sinfulness, understanding here absolutely all that is sinful.† Although he is correct in saying that the *appropriation* of this forgiveness of sins as a fact cannot be conceived of, without the transformation of the man proceeding from it as a *consequence*, yet we must still maintain that nothing is said here about the latter, but only that redemption, like the forgiveness, has its complete objective reality entirely irrespective of the subjective state of the individuals (HARLESS). [Accepting this view, which is that of HODGE, EADIE and others, we must deny ALFORD's remark, that this phrase is not to be limited, but is "at least equipollent with ἀπολύτρωσις."—R.]

According to the riches of his grace.—*Κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ* evidently designates the grace of God, not of Christ, as the ultimate ground of the fact of Redemption, and corresponding (*κατά*) to the depth and importance of the same in its riches. Similarly ii. 7: *τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος*, Rom. ii. 4: *πλοῦτος τῆς χρηστότητος*, Rom. ix. 23; Col. i. 27; Eph. iii. 16: *τῆς δόξης*. Hence it is not=*gratia liberalissima* (KOPPE). Instead of *τὸ πλοῦτος*, attested by ℵ. and B., and to be retained here, *ὁ πλοῦτος* more frequently occurs. [Comp. *Textual Note* [4].] PASSAVANT aptly says: "We have in this grace not only deliverance from misery and curse, not only forgiveness—we find in it the freedom, the glory, the heritage of the children of God, the crown of eternal life."

[ALFORD is not correct in saying this clause of itself prevents the limitation of *ἄφεσιν* to mere forgiveness. EADIE seems to catch the spirit of the passage best. "Atonement is not in antagonism with grace. For the opulence of His grace is seen not only in its innumerable forms and varieties of operation among men, but also in the unasked and unmerited provision of such an atonement—as the blood of the 'Beloved One.'" —R.] With the forgiveness of sin we gain access to *all* the treasures of Divine grace (GERLACH). Hence the Apostle continues as in the following verse.

Ver. 8. **Which he made to abound toward us** [*ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς*].—Ἧς, referring to *τῆς χάριτος*, which is imparted, not parted, cannot be, as in Luke xv. 17: *περισσεύουσιν ἄρτων*, a partitive genitive (ERASMUS: *de qua ubertim nobis impartivit*); but is here an attraction for *ἥν*, since the *ἐπερίσσευσε* is to be rendered, transitively in accordance with the context (ver. 9: *γνωρίσας*), and with the accusative like 2 Cor. ix. 8 (*δυνατὸς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς πᾶσαν χάριν περισσεῦσαι εἰς ὑμᾶς*; comp. iv. 15; 1 Thess. iii. 12). THEOPHYLACT aptly says: *ἀφθόνως ἐξέχεε*. It is not in accordance with the language or context to take it as instead of *ᾗ* (*Vulgate: quæ superabundavit*) or *ᾗ* (CALVIN: *qua redundavit*). [So E. V., but such an attraction of the dative is not found in the New Testament, while the attraction of the nominative (*Vulgate*) is scarcely possible.—R.]—Εἰς ἡμᾶς, into us He has caused His grace to flow abundantly.

In all wisdom and prudence [*ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει**].—The word *πάσῃ*, without the article, designates every one there is (WINER, p. 105). Comp. ver. 2; Col. iv. 12.—Πᾶς sets forth the multiplicity, fulness, always extensiveness, never intensity, force (HARLESS); hence it is not=*summa* (WAHL, RUECKERT). *Σοφία καὶ φρόνησις* cannot be taken as exact synonymes (KOPPE), nor so distinguished, that the former is used *de præterito et præsenti, de his, quæ Deus facit* (ver. 17), the latter *de futuro, de his, quæ nos faciemus* (ANSELM, BENGEL). *Wisdom* designates rather a normal state of the mind in the centre of intelligence, *prudence* the special turning of the same in different directions; *ἡ δὲ σοφία ἀνδρὶ τίκτει φρόνησιν* (Prov. x. 23); the latter is subordinate to the former. Besides this formal distinction, the material difference must be considered: Wisdom grasps God's doings, perceives and understands His counsels of grace, prudence is directed to what we have to do, looks at our problem and how to solve it; the former clearly sees the relations ordered by God, the latter regulates our conduct accordingly. Thus every kind of wisdom and prudence is indicated by "all," and "in" marks that God has caused His grace to flow abundantly into us, in the gift of all wisdom and prudence. So also in the parallel passage, Col. i. 9: *ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει*. Accordingly this is not to be taken as= "manifold wisdom" (iii. 10), and, as in *ἐν ἀγάπῃ*

*[On this distinction, comp. TRENCH, *Synonymes, N. T.*, § 33; COCCEIUS has a special treatise, *De utilitate distinctionis inter πάρεσιν et ἄφεσιν* (Opp. t. vii.) See SCHAFF, *Romans*, p. 128, *Textual Note* [8].—R.]

†[On *παράπτωμα* see Dr. SCHAFF's note (Rom. v. 15) p. 182, and the subsequent discussions. The positions taken there forbid any such wide reference as that of OLSHAUSEN. ELLICOTT, while not laying much stress upon the distinction between *παραπτώματα* and *ἁμαρτίαι*, takes the former as pointing more to sins on the side of commission, *sinful acts*, the latter to sins as the result of a state, *sinful conditions*.—R.]

* [ELLICOTT renders this word: *discernment* or *intelligence* adding a very discriminating note.—R.]

προορίσας (ver. 5), to be joined with the following *γνωρίσας* (JEROME, CHRYS., SEMLER [EADIE], and others), nor to be applied to God, to whom indeed *φρόνησις* (1 Kings iii. 28; Jer. x. 12) may be ascribed, but not *πᾶσα* in such a way as to mean that not only is all wisdom and prudence in Him, but that He acts, does this or that in *all* wisdom and prudence (HARLESS).

[The view here defended is also that of HARLESS, MEYER and ELLICOTT, the three most exact commentators on this Epistle. Comp. the note of the last named on the *meaning*, *reference* and *connection* of these words. ALFORD follows DE WETTE in referring them to God, taking the same view of the connection as given above, while EADIE refers them to man, but connects them with *γνωρίσας*. HODGE joins this phrase to the object of the verb instead of to the verb itself, and inexactly renders the preposition *ἐν*: in connection with, together with; his view of *φρόνησις* is also objectionable.—R.]

Ver. 9. **Having made known to us.**—*Γνωρίσας* denotes, as in vers. 4, 5, the manner of the *ἐπερίσσευσε* (WINER, p. 322), explaining "in all wisdom and prudence." The verb means to make known, without stating any thing as to the means used. Comp. iii. 3, 5; Gal. i. 12; Col. i. 25. [The perfect participle in English is indefinite, and serves best to express the idea of the Greek aorist participle, which here denotes an act coincident, and terminating synchronously with the finite verb (MEYER, ELLICOTT). The best paraphrase would be: in that He made known (ALFORD).—R.].—"Us" means Christians, believers, not merely Paul or the Apostles.

The mystery of his will, *τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ*.—[The genitive is that of the object: the mystery concerning His will (MEYER, ELLICOTT, ALFORD and now EADIE). On *θέλημα* see ver. 11.—R.] This mystery is the object made known. He terms it "of Christ" in iii. 10, because He is the Mediator of the same; "of the gospel," vi. 19, because it is thereby proclaimed; "of faith," "of godliness," 1 Tim. iii. 9, 16, because it is comprehended and preserved only by faith, and the fear of God in faith; here "of his will," because it is willed by God. It is the decree of Redemption in Christ. In iii. 9: Col. i. 25, 26; Rom. xvi. 25, 26; 1 Cor. iii. 7–10, its depth and concealment as well as its revelation are described. This decree, a secret from all eternity in the fullest sense for the Gentiles, hinted and adumbrated in Israel by prophecies and types, is now manifest in Christ, to those only, however, who are true believers (1 Cor. iii. 12), to those who are lost, it remains concealed (2 Cor. iv. 3). It is a secret which has become public, ceasing henceforth to be a secret, yet ever having and still retaining in itself what surpasses all reason (HARLESS, STIER).

According to his good pleasure, *κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ*, defines more closely the *γνωρίσας*, "having made known."—Comp. ver. 5. [The making known is thus defined as having taken place in strict dependence, both in time and manner, on the will of God (ALFORD, ELLICOTT). EADIE retains here the meaning *benevolentia*, which is quite inadmissible, more so than in ver. 5.—R.]

Which he purposed in himself, *ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ*.—The determination is thus marked as an internal one, so as to give prominence to its freedom; hence we should read *αὑτῷ* (HARLESS, TISCHENDORF), not *αὐτῷ* (MEYER). [The latter reading is adopted by ALFORD, EADIE, ELLICOTT, all of them claiming that if the pronoun refers to God (and we cannot well accept any other reference) the reflexive form is necessary. In ver. 5, they urge, another idea had intervened, hence *αὐτόν* was there sufficiently explicit, but here the immediate connection with the verb and its subject requires the form *αὑτῷ*. This is opposed to the theory advanced in ver. 5, that this reflexive form never occurs in the New Testament; but it is safer to accept this reading than to refer the pronoun to Christ.—R.]

In the compound verb *προτίθεσθαι*, *sibi proponere* (BENGEL, PASSOW *sub voce*), the preposition *προ* is *local* (MEYER): to put before one's self, not *temporal*=beforehand. So also in *πρόθεσις*, ver. 11; Rom. i. 13; iii. 25; Acts iii. 20 (*προχειρίζομαι*); 2 Cor. ix. 7 (*προαιρέομαι*). Accordingly *εὐδοκία* is not=good pleasure (LUTHER), gracious purpose (HARLESS), and *ἐν αὐτῷ* is not to be referred to Christ (CHRYSOSTOM, LUTHER: *hervorgebracht durch Ihn*, BENGEL), nor is *προέθετο*=*ante constituit* (ANSELM), *apud se retinuit* (CALVIN). [As Meyer remarks, this purpose is to be regarded as taking place before the foundation of the world, but the preposition does not express this.—R.]

Ver. 10. **Unto the dispensation of the fulness of times** [*εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν*].—This verse follows, setting forth the goal of the *πρόθεσις*. *Εἰς* designates the tendency, the aim, as in iv. 30; Gal. iii. 17, 23 (WINER, p. 371), with a view to which He purposed in Himself; hence it is to be closely joined with *προέθετο*, not with *γνωρίσας* (BENGEL), which is too remote. Of course *εἰς* is not =*in* (*Vulgate*), nor *usque ad* (ERASMUS, CALVIN), for which *ἕως*, *μέχρι*, would be used. [HODGE and EADIE: *with reference to*, a view of the preposition which MEYER often favors, but which fails to bring out its full force here.—R.]

Οἰκονομία, from *οἰκόνομος*, is stewardship (Luke xvi. 2); it is transferred to the spiritual sphere in iii. 2, 6; 1 Tim. i. 4. The original meaning is modified in two ways, according as the word in its connection "designated the activity of a governing or subordinate subject; in the first case: arrangement, disposition, in the second: management, execution" (HARLESS). Thus the context in 1 Cor. ix. 17 defines the word in the second sense, of the apostolic office and service. Here God, and that towards which He has formed a purpose, are spoken of; so it here means: unto, with a view to the disposition. LUTHER correctly renders the *εἰς* of the aim, but limits *οἰκονομίαν* too much: that it may be preached; so GROTIUS: *ut suo demum tempore publicaret*. THEOPHYLACT (*διοίκησις*) and the *Vulgate* (*dispensatio*) restrict it too much. RUECKERT's complaint about the omission of the article is entirely unnecessary, as in Rom. i. 1, which is a parallel for our passage, we read: *εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ*, "unto the gospel of God." The article is wanting on

account of the following genitive, which defines our word more fully, and is to be joined most closely with it: so λόγον ζωῆς (Phil. ii. 16)= *Lebenswort*, "Word of life," ἡμέρα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, "day of Christ." Comp. WINER, p. 118 ff. According to this, we should take the phrase to mean: *fulfilment—economy*.

The genitive τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν defines then οἰκονόμιαν more closely. "*Verbo πληρόω et πλήρωμα persæpe utitur Paulus ad Ephesios et Colossenses* (BENGEL). According to the well known investigations of FRITZSCHE (*Ad Rom.* II. p. 473, and a *Dissertation*, Rostock, 1839)—although HOFMANN (*Schriftbeweis*, I. 2, p 118) denies the active and passive senses of the word, seeking to prove that its meaning is: contents, full amount, complement [*i. e.*, the first of the following senses]—πλήρωμα signifies (1.) *id quo res impletur* [this is often called the active sense, but is not strictly so, see on ver. 23.—R.], (2.) *id quod impletur* [the strictly passive sense= τὸ πεπληρωμένον, that which is filled, or the state of having been filled and continuing so, *fulness;* this being the more usual meaning of verbals in μα.—R.], (3.) *implendi actionem* [the proper active meaning], the passive sense being more prevalent than the active. According to this view, the second signification is to be accepted here, as in Gal. iv. 4: τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, that which is filled, the state of fulness, the fulness of time.

Between the two passages there is however a difference, occasioned by τοῦ χρόνου and τῶν καιρῶν. Here definite καιροί are spoken of. Although we find in Mark i. 15: πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός, because *one* point of time is referred to, yet in 1 Tim. ii. 6, the proclamation of salvation is said to take place καιροῖς ἰδίοις, and in Luke xxi. 24 καιροὶ ἐθνῶν are mentioned, as in Acts i. 7 χρόνους ἢ καιρούς. And in the passage strictly parallel (ii. 7) it is said that ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσι, τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις, God would show the riches of His grace toward the congregation of the believers. Hence we must apply the word here to different sections of time, linked on to each other, through which the plan of salvation is unfolded, since God ever revealed what and so much as was requisite, to advance the development of His Kingdom, so soon as the end of one period of time in the history of Redemption arrived, and an epoch had fulfilled its task and passed away; while τοῦ χρόνου in the passage from Galatians marks these details in their connection as a totality. The fulfilment of these definite periods and points of time, adapted for the required development, is to be understood here: ὁ ὁρισθεὶς παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καιρός (THEODORET), the point of time, with the entrance of which the pre-Messianic periods are closed and the Messianic ages begin.

The genitive τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν indicates then what belongs to οἰκονομία, the external and internal relation to it. Comp. WINER, p. 176 ff. [So ELLICOTT and EADIE; the former has a capital note on this genitive, which he calls a genitive of the *characterizing quality*.—R.] We have therefore here indicated, that the fulfilling of the times stands under the guidance of God Himself, who has determined and ordered the periods and brings them in according to His purpose. Hence we explain it as: *dispensatio propria plenitudini temporum* (CALOV., RUECKERT, MEYER, MATTHIES, STIER [HODGE, ELLICOTT, EADIE] and others). HARLESS takes the genitive as epexegetical, subjoining the special to the general; but οἰκονομία, that which is arranged by the Lord, is not explained by πλήρωμα, a developing process, nor that mode of action by a fact, such as the latter undoubtedly is. SCHENKEL accepts a genitive of the object, as though "the fulness of the times" was the object of "dispensation;" but while ἦλθε (Gal. iv. 4) may be predicated of that πλήρωμα, οἰκονομεῖται cannot be, and οἰκονομία has the καιρούς as the object of its νέμειν, the result of this being the πλήρωμα. LUTHER's rendering is too limited: *dass es geprédigt würde, da die Zeit erfüllt war.* It should not be explained, as if we read ἐν τῷ πληρώματι: *tempore exacto* (WOLF), or *aliquo tempore, suo tempore* (MORUS); nor should it be referred to *extrema tempora* (KOPPE) still less is it=*eorum quæ restant temporum*, or *in reliquis, i. e., novi fœderis temporibus* (STIER* and others). Unpauline as well as unbiblical is USTERI's explanation, the fulfilling of that time has had its ground in the necessary development of the human consciousness, or of the religious spirit of humanity.† God's gracious design applies then to a dispensation, which ordains time and its periods, leading to a point when they are completed. This is still further defined by what follows:

To gather up together all things.—[ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα. Braune: *to gather together again for Himself all things.*]—The verb is derived from κεφάλαιον, the chief point, and means principally, to gather together in one main point, as Rom. xiii. 9, where it is said of the single commandments, that they are "briefly comprehended" in the one command of love (ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται), *summatim comprehendere.* But it is acknowledged, that the Apostle, "who does not etymologize, but follows general accords" (HARLESS), might readily have chosen the word, in order to play upon the word κεφαλή, the head, which according to i. 22 is Christ (CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT, LUTHER: "comprehended together under one head," CALOV., WOLF, HARLESS, STIER, SCHENKEL, MATTHIES and others). As *recapitulare* passes over *capitulum* to *caput* in its meaning, so too ἀνακεφαλαιοῦν over κεφάλαιον to κεφαλή. [The play on the word is barely possible. Paul's usage favors it, but the context is against it, since "in Christ" follows so soon, and the idea of Christ as Head occurs much further on, the reference here being more to His atonement than to His sovereignty. He is regarded as κεφάλαιον rather than as κεφαλή (MEYER).—R.]

* [ALFORD argues at some length in favor of the reference to the whole gospel dispensation, "the giving forth of the gospel under God's providential arrangements." Against his view, see EADIE.—R.]

† [It is certainly true that God comprehended this development in His plan, and that it was an important factor in carrying out "the dispensation of the fulness of times," though its importance has not been recognized until lately by theologians and church historians EADIE well observes: "The πλήρωμα is regarded as a vast receptacle into which centuries and milleniums had been falling, but it was now filled." "That fulness of the time in which this economy was founded, is the *precise* period, for the Lord has appointed it; and the *best* period, for the age was ripe for the event." The view of Dr. Braune is so well stated and agrees so entirely with that of the most exact of modern commentators, that further supplement is needless.—R.]

Although the meaning of the preposition (ἀνα, *again*) does not appear in the verb, Rom. xiii. 9, since it would be too artificial to retain it with HARLESS, because of an assumed reference to the local position of the law given in detail Exod. xx. and afterwards summed up and repeated, Lev. xix. 18 (THILO renders Rom. xiii. 9, *repetere*), still there is no ground for not retaining it here (see PASSOW *sub voce*), where the reference is to a gathering of what was dispersed and a renewal of what was ruined, and not originally so. The word may indeed apply to an entirely new fact, but it still refers back to an original status and beginning (MEYER, HARLESS, STIER).* Comp. Col. i. 15–17.

Finally the middle form must not be left unnoticed: God will gather together again for Himself (*sibi*) what He has created for Himself; this supports at the same time the meaning *again*. Accordingly the following explanations are unsatisfactory: *a principio renovare* (*Syriac*), *instaurare* (*Vulgate*), giving an explanation of the character of the gathering together; συγκεφαλαιοῦσθαι (RAPHEL), to subject all things at once to Christ; borrowing the phrase from rhetoric, to recapitulate (JEROME, ERASMUS, BEZA), or from military usage=*in unum agmen cogere* (GROTIUS) or from arithmetic=*in unam summam redigere* (CAMERARIUS, BUCER), although in each of these there is something more or less correct.

The infinitive is to be taken as epexegetical; it brings forward as an explanation the design † which obtains in the "dispensation of the fulness of times" (WINER, p. 300): in order to gather together under one head for Himself. But how? **In Christ.**—Nothing further is said; in the resumptive ἐν αὐτῷ we find an explanation. We must maintain however that ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ refers to the Saviour who appeared in the fulness of time (the article is in any case inserted purposely and for emphasis), thus preparing the way for the statement of the object. *What* then is to be gathered together? All things.

The things which are in heaven, and the things which are on earth [τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. See *Textual Note* [10]]. Τὰ πάντα is neuter and universal, the more because this explanatory clause is added. No importance is to be attached to the plural (οὐρανοῖς), since we find in Phil. iii. 20: ἐν οὐρανοῖς—ἐξ οὗ; despite its different regions (2 Cor. xii. 2: ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ) heaven is conceived of as a unity, over against the earth. The well-attested ἐπί is at all events an error of the transcriber or a provincialism, beside which the established ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς could not appear strange. The repeated article denotes the particularity of what is found in both spheres. Heaven and earth have become places of sin (ii. 2; vi. 12); indeed heaven was the first theatre of sin, when a part of the angels fell into sin and from God (1 Tim. iii. 6; 1 John iii. 8; Jas. ii. 19; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6); thence it came to earth (2 Cor. xi. 3), in ever greater dimensions (1 Cor. x. 20, 21). Thus the state originally appointed by God and the development He wished to be without disturbance, ceased (Rom. viii. 18–24), so that a renewing of the heavens and of the earth was taken into view (2 Pet. iii. 13). The centre of this renewal is Christ and His redeeming work (Col. i. 20), which, however, has its development also, as before His appearance up to the "fulness of times," so afterwards up to His second Advent, when the "restitution of all things" (Acts iii. 21), the *palingenesia* (Matth. xix. 28), will be introduced. Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 10–13.

It is altogether unmistakable that, in accordance with the views of this Epistle as well as the entire organism of Scripture truth, we must apply this to the totality of the creation (HARLESS, OLSHAUSEN, MATTHIES, MEYER, STIER, HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, I. 216 ff., SCHENKEL and others). If we maintain with BENGEL: *Omnia sub Christo fuerant; per peccatum autem facta erat avulsio et divulsio; atque hæc rursum sublata est*, then only such a "restitution of all things" is here treated of, as takes into the account, not the relations of the individual members, of the individuals of the τὰ πάντα, to each other, nor yet the relations of the same in their diversity over against God and Christ, but rather and only the relation of Christ to the totality. We should neither specialize and restrict too much, as does HOFMANN, who excludes good angels and evil men, and others, who apply it only to intelligence, persons,* nor accept an unspecialized thought (HARLESS), indefinitely in suspense and admitting of no specialization, respecting a totality. If it could be inferred from the fact of the angels not needing redemption, that they were excluded here, we should be finally obliged to except redeemed men from this ἀνακεφαλαίωσις and no longer regard them as under Christ, when their redemption was completed. "The reconciliation through Christ is to the Apostle a fact, whose effects permeate the universe, which affects alike the conscious and the unconscious creation, whether it be touched by sin, or not, as is the case with the good angels" (OLSHAUSEN). Here we may certainly apply what BENGEL so aptly remarks on Rom. viii. 19, that *pro suo quodque genus captu*, and *statu* may be appended, participate in this *Anacephalaiosis*, the evil as conquered and rejected opponents, the good angels as participating, ministering friends, the redeemed as accepted children, the rest of creation as subordinate companions, as theatre of the honors. It is precisely "the restoration of the harmony of

* [The force of ἀνά, *again*, should be retained, it would seem, for Rom. xiii. 9, can include such a notion irrespective of the forced assumption of HARLESS. HODGE and ALFORD indeed are timid about admitting it, lest it be turned to an improper use, but there is undoubtedly a restoration implied in Redemption, although restoration falls very far short of the latter idea.—R.]

† [HARLESS takes it as depending on "the mystery of his will." The general idea is the same, but such a connection would give to the intervening words too much of a parenthetical character.—R.]

* [Perhaps the most restricted view is that of Dr. HODGE: "The redeemed from among men, some of whom are now in heaven and others are still on earth." This he defends by a number of reasons, all of which I am forced to consider irrelevant. The great mistake is in his giving too wide a scope to the *anacephalaiosis*, insisting that it means such a gathering together as implies redemption in its fullest sense, for which there is no authority, save the assumed paranomasia in the word. Granting this position, the restriction of τὰ πάντα follows as a matter of course. It would seem to be a far better method to take τὰ πάντα in its appropriate sense, *all things*, even at the risk of limiting a doubtful word like ἀνακεφαλαιοῦσθαι, than to give it the sense of the masculine, which it never has. This restricted view seems to be adopted more from doctrinal than exegetical reasons.—R.]

the Universe" (Harless), which is aimed at. Chrysostom makes the excellent remark; ὡς ἄν περί οἰκίας τις εἴποι τὰ μὲν σαθρὰ τὰ δὲ ἰσχυρὰ ἐχούσης, ἀνῳκοδόμησε τὴν οἰκίαν—οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα πάντας ὑπὸ μίαν ἤγαγε κεφαλήν. That nothing is said of "the restoration of all things," is quite evident. (See *Doctr. Note* 8.)*

Even in him, ἐν αὐτῷ, is to be joined to "things in heaven, and things on earth," as "in Christ" is with "all things," since the two clauses are entirely parallel (Harless). Grotius well says: "*Sed repetendum censuit, quasi diceret: per ipsum, inquam, unum, non per ullum alium; non hoc factum per Mosen, non per philosophos.*" Hence it is not a Hebraism or Syriasm (Rueckert, who acknowledges the "not feeble repetition"), nor to be joined with the following ἐν ᾧ as pleonastic. Thus, then, the person of Christ is noted as the Mediator and middle-point of this comprehensive reuniting, and that *without* Him such does not and shall not take place. ["Re-asseverating with great solemnity and emphasis (see Jelf, Gr. § 658), the only blessed sphere in which this ἀνακεφ. can be regarded as operative, and apart from which, and without which, its energies cannot be conceived as acting. It forms also an easy transition to the following relative" (Ellicott).—R.]

It is arbitrary and unscriptural (Meyer) for Calov. and others to assume that Christ is as to His Divine nature the Head of angels, as to His human nature the Head of men. This *anacephalaiosis* is not to be applied to the completion of the kingdom of God in the resurrection of the body (Theodoret, Jerome), and still less to the moral uniting of antagonistic endeavors (Koppe, Wahl); nor should we determine from Col. i. 20, how it is to be conceived of or to take place, but rather confess that our passage says nothing about this.

* [Comp. Meyer *in loco*. He says: "The doctrine of *restoration*, according to which even those who have remained unbelieving, and finally devils, shall yet attain to blessedness, contrary as it is to the whole tenor of the New Testament, finds no support in our passage either (against Chrysostom and others), where in ἀνακεφαλ, *etc.*, the *exclusion* of the unbelieving and the demoniacal powers and their banishment to Gehenna is self-evident in connection with the Christian consciousness of faith, so that the *anacephalaiosis* does not apply to *every single individual*, but to the whole complex of things heavenly and earthly, which, after the anti-christian individuals have been excluded and transferred to hell, shall be joined in unity under God in the renewed world again, as formerly before sin all in heaven and on earth was thus united. Olshausen therefore incorrectly thinks our passage (like Col. i. 20) is to be placed in accord with the general type of Scriptural teaching, by finding in the infinitive ἀνακεφ. the *purpose* of God, 'which, in the founding of redemption furnished with unlimited power, has in view the establishment of *universal harmony*, the restoration of *all that is lost*.' Irrespective of the fact that the infinitive is epexegetical, it is altogether unscriptural to assume that in redemption there is purposed a restoration of *all* that is lost, even of the devils. For those passages which speak of the universality of redemption and such sayings as 1 Pet. iv. 6; Phil. ii. 10 f., leave entirely untouched the constant doctrine of the New Testament respecting eternal damnation. As regards the devils, the purpose of God in the economy of redemption was to *conquer* them (1 John iii. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 24), and to deliver them to the punishment of eternal torment already passed upon them (Matt. xxv. 41; Jude 6; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Rev. xx. 1 ff.; comp. Bertholdt, *Christologie*, p. 223). In the New Testament there is no single thought of the restoration of devils, as this is conceived of as an impossibility in the case of the radically antitheistic spirits. The prince of this world is only *judged*." No one can accuse Meyer of theological bias, or of ungrammatical exegesis, hence his opinion is quoted entire.—R.]

Ver. 11. **In whom we were also made his inheritance** [ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐκληρώθημεν].—A comma only is to be placed after "in Him;" "in whom," which refers to it, marks the union with Him (hence not = through whom, Koppe, Flatt) as the way to the obtaining of the inheritance, which is rendered prominent by the καί; were the emphasis on the subject we should find καὶ ἡμεῖς here, as in ver. 13: καὶ ὑμεῖς. Incorrect: *in quo etiam nos* (*Vulgate*, Erasmus). [The E. V.: "in whom also" is equally objectionable in connecting καί with ἐν ᾧ.—R.] Prominence is given to the fact, that the plan of God is already in the process of accomplishment, in accordance with the decree and design; καί is not indeed=*really*, it joins with ἐκληρώθημεν, only what is to be inferred from the preceding context: we are destined, and this connection points to the actualization.

Κληροῦν is found here only; the compound προσεκληρώθησαν in Acts xvii. 4. It is derived, not from κληρονομία, but from κλῆρος, lot (Matth. xxvii. 35; Acts i. 26), portion of an inheritance (Acts xxvi. 18; Col. i. 14), used in a spiritual sense, and transferred to men, to the church composed of individuals (1 Pet. v. 3; τῶν κλήρων). Since this usage is well established, and there is no sufficient reason why the passive sense should not be retained here, we explain: we have become κλῆρος (*i. e.*, of God, as the context requires) in Christ. Bengel: *hic loquitur per personam Israelis; eramus facti* נַחֲלָה *κλῆρος seu κληρονομία, sors, hereditas domini.* Deut. xxxii. 9. So also Stier. The context (ver. 12: "that we should be," ver. 14:) "purchased possession" supports the requirements of the language. Hence it is not to be explained with Luther: through whom we also have come to an inheritance, nor with most: have become partakers of the inheritance; nor yet *accepimus* (Morus), *contigit nobis, ut* (Koppe).

[The view here taken of the verb is ably defended by Alford and Ellicott, and the ordinary interpretation by Hodge and Eadie. The passive form calls for a passive sense, unless there are very strong reasons to the contrary. It would seem that the other sense is allowable, but the only grounds for adopting it here are (1) the objective character of the whole passage, (2) the parallel passage, Col. i. 12. But the sense: we have become an inheritance, is subjective only in form, presenting as it does something which God has become to us, quite as much as what we have become. The other reason is in itself of little weight, for the parallel is inexact in other respects. We adopt the passive sense, rejecting however the allusion to the lot as indicating God's freedom of choice, and accepting the special meaning given by Bengel.—R.]

Finally it is clear that the subject ("we") is not put in antithesis to another one, as in ver. 14, and that no limitation is indicated either in the verb or in the following participle, so that according to the context and ver. 1, we may apply it to the Apostle and his readers, to Christians in general, but not to the Apostle alone (Koppe), nor to him and the Jewish Christians (Grotius, Bengel, Harless, Stier, Schenkel

[HODGE] and others). [BARNES restricts it to the ministers of religion. MEYER, EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, agree with BRAUNE.—R.]

Having been predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things [προορισθέντες κατὰ πρόθεσιν τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος].—We who have become an inheritance, are predestinated. A comparison with ver. 5: "having predestinated us unto adoption," shows us the progress and the distinction. Here it is further defined by the phrase "according to the purpose" from ver. 9 (ἣν προέθετο), that the predestinated is grounded in Him, in His design, His will. Accordingly He whose design it is, is termed: τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος,* "the God, who ordains, prepares and carries forward to its goal the Redemption," who is "therein the All-efficient, Almighty" (STIER); τὰ πάντα is both what is external and historical in the world's story, as well as in the life of individuals, and what is spiritual and internal (Gal. ii. 8; iii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 11.)

This working is further defined by the phrase: **After the counsel of his will** κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ. Similar to this is τὰς βουλὰς τῶν καρδιῶν (1 Cor. iv. 5). HARLESS compares: the desire of my heart, the joy of my eyes, the tears of my sorrow, as examples of the exchange of the simple subject into the activity, or peculiarity, or organ of the subject, which is the ground or means of a mental or sensuous manifestation, in order thus with exactness and definiteness to render prominent the close relation between the two. A similar case is 1 Pet. iii. 17: εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ. Βουλή is then the decision, the determination which God forms in His will. See above on ver. 5. It is God absolutely free (MATTHIES), His *consilium liberrimum* (BENGEL). Τὰ πάντα is not *ad id negotium, de quo agitur, adstringendum* (GROTIUS), nor are βουλή and τοῦ θελήματος mere synonymes, as has been affirmed without ground of προορισθέντες and πρόθεσις also, nor yet=*voluntas liberrima* (KOPPE).

[The two words βουλή and θέλημα naturally lead to remarks upon the distinction between the verbs from which they are derived θέλειν and βούλεσθαι.† The distinction of BUTTMANN will not apply in the New Testament. He says (*Lexic. sub voce*): "βούλομαι is confined to the *inclination*, θέλω to that kind of wish in which there lies a *purpose* or *design*." But in Matth. i. 19, where both words occur, they cannot be thus distinguished; for Joseph's inclination was not to expose his wife, and this is expressed by θέλων, while his purpose to put her away is expressed by ἐβουλήθη. It is rather in this case, as ALFORD says: "θέλω expresses the mere wish, βούλομαι the wish ripened into intention," in favor of which view he cites BUTTMANN however. TITTMANN on the other hand, while seeming to agree with BUTTMANN, and usually cited as sustaining him, really differs from him. In his *Synonym. N. T.*, p. 134 ff, he says that θέλειν is simply to will (*simpliciter velle*), while βούλεσθαι denotes further the inclination. His citation of Ammonius who remarks that the latter cannot be predicated of brutes, would prove that deliberation also was implied in it. He further adds that he who does anything θέλων, does it spontaneously, while he who does it βουλόμενος, determines to turn his mind to that matter. So PLATO (*Laws*, v.) opposes τὸ βουλητόν τε καὶ ἑκούσιον and τὸ ἀβούλητόν τε καὶ ἀκούσιον. This distinction would justify the remark of BRAUNE (on ver. 5) that βουλή is the act of willing joined with inclination, while ἐθέλειν is the ethical act. Yet TITTMANN and others are scarcely justified in denying to θέλειν any sense of desiring, wishing, *etc.* With the infinitive such a meaning is common, as in the well-known formula: "I would not have you ignorant" (οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, Rom. i. 13, *etc.*), and in Rom. vii. 15 ff., where the antithesis is μισῶ. Besides the spontaneity of will may, after all, indicate an impulse from the side of the desire: who can decide? One thing is certain, we cannot, save by a species of anthropomorphism, apply such distinctions to God, *e. g.*, 1 Tim. ii. 4: "who will (θέλει) have all men to be saved;" 2 Pet. iii. 9: "not willing (βουλόμενος) that any should perish." We dare not, it seems to me, say that one passage refers to God's spontaneous will and the other to His inclination. In fact any discrimination between the two words for doctrinal purposes is of doubtful propriety, for there is no conflict in God, such as we find in us. Still we need not hesitate to explain "the counsel of His will" as meaning, the definite and deliberate volition of God's free, sovereign, spontaneous will. A pure *voluntas* on His part involves the accordant desire, purpose, determination and volition, all questions respecting priority being out of place. So ELLICOTT, whether correct in his distinction or not, is right in saying that our passage "solemnly *represents* the Almighty Will as displaying itself in action: θέλημα designating the will generally, βουλή the more special expression of it." So MEYER, ALFORD (on 1 Tim. v. 14) make this general distinction: "θέλω is the resting inclination of the will, βούλομα its active exertion," which is valid enough here. On the whole EADIE is most judicious in his remarks, preserving TITTMANN's distinction, and yet admitting the idea of desire in θέλω. "Θέλημα is will, the result of desire—*voluntas;* βουλή is counsel, the result of a formal decision—*propositum.*" Donaldson's *New Cratylus*, §§ 463, 464. Here βουλή is the ratified expression of will—the decision to which His will has come. The Divine mind is not in a state of indifference, it has exercised θέλημα—will; and that will is not a lethargic *velleity*, for it has formed a definite purpose, βουλή, which it determines to carry out.—R.]

* [ALFORD: "Energizes; but especially in and among material previously given, as here, in His material creation, and in the spirits of all flesh, also His creation." The same author remarks on the repetition of the notion of predestination: "Here first the Apostle comes to the idea of the universal church, the whole Israel of God, and therefore here brings forward again that fore-ordination which he had indeed hinted at generally in ver. 5, but which properly belonged to Israel, and is accordingly predicated of the Israel of the church."—R.]

† [In my note on *Colossians*, p. 35, I refer to Dr. Hitchcock's views on this point. While it is a matter of regret as regards this work as a whole that Prof. Hitchcock, owing to ill health, was obliged to abandon his intention to edit Ephesians, it is especially unfortunate that his studies on this distinction could not be incorporated here. His conclusions, however, agree in the main with those of TITTMANN, as given above.—R.]

Ver. 12. **That we should be unto the praise of his glory** [*εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης αὐτοῦ*. The *Rec.* inserts *τῆς* before *δόξης* on very slight authority.—R.]—This marks the goal, which is set up for those who are "predestinated" in the "purpose," with the further definition: "to the praise of his glory." Comp. ver. 6. Here He Himself and His glory are the object of the praise, as in ver. 14. This expression, three times repeated, and always used at the close of a circle of thought, must be explained each time in the same way, and so that the emphasis which is laid on it be not lessened; accordingly we must retain its force as a designation of the aim or goal, remembering that *εἶναι* precedes it; a *being* is spoken of, which is attained through a *becoming*, and this status is that of *persons* (*ἡμᾶς*), who not merely praise with the mouth, in words, but *should be themselves a praise.* Hence the phrase is not all to be regarded as an *incisum* or as parenthetical, nor should we join "that we should be" either with "in Christ" (ZELTNER) or with "who before hoped" (KNAPP, FLATT, HARLESS, OLSHAUSEN and others), as though the thought were: the goal of the predestination is, that we who before hoped, should be in Christ, to the praise and glory of God, or that we to God's glory, hoped before in Christ. MORUS: *ut adeo in Christo spem reponere possimus in laudem honoremque Dei.* This displaces the proper aim, and what it substitutes cannot be an aim; the hope of the Jews, the faith of the Gentiles.

We who have before hoped in Christ [or **the Christ**]. — *Τοὺς προηλπικότας* = *quippe qui antea spem posuerunt* (WINER, p. 127);* it characterizes those who have thus become to the praise of God, by pointing out the way to this. The construction is not singular (1 Cor. xv. 19: *ἐν Χριστῷ ἠλπικότες*; Rom. xv. 13; *ἐλπὶς ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου*, before in ver. 12: *ἐπ' αὐτῷ—ἐλπιοῦσιν*). "In Christ," *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*, marks this vital fellowship with Him; it is not = *εἰς τὸν Χριστόν*, towards Him, to Him; He is the ground of the hope.

And now *πρό*! It points to the state and the period before attaining the appointed goal, hence to the earthly life; it is a designation of the Christian state in the pilgrimage. Hence BENGEL very properly remarks: *τὸ ante refertur ad tempora V. T.*, but he is incorrect in referring "before" to persons as though the Jews were thus indicated (*primum nacti sunt Judæi deinde gentes*, Acts xix. 46). So CHRYSOSTOM, ERASMUS, HARLESS, STIER, MEYER and others. But *προελπίζειν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ* is not = *προσδέχεσθαι* (Luke ii. 25, 28), notwithstanding Acts xxviii. 20; xxvi. 6, 7. This phrase is added to what precedes in order, as in ver. 6, to furnish at *the same time* a point of connection for what follows, a transition; hence at the close (ver. 14) no such addition is made.

[The view defended above is that of DE WETTE,† and of EADIE (in his first edition). Nearly all modern commentators accept at this point a distinction between *ἡμεῖς* and *ὑμεῖς*, referring the former to Jewish Christians, the latter to Gentile Christians. (The other view refers the former to Christians in general, the latter to the readers.) I am constrained to differ from Dr. Braune here, and adopt the common opinion. (1) No other view allows to *προ* its proper meaning. To refer the participle to the earthly life, seems far-fetched. The word would not be an appropriate *characteristic* of all Christians in this connection. Nor is the reference to before the time of writing, worthy of the context. (2) The antithetical *καὶ ὑμεῖς* (ver. 13) is well-nigh conclusive, especially if it be taken as the direct subject of the verb *ἐσφραγίσθητε*. The Jews had in the Messianic prophecies a ground for their hoping before, but a *sealing* was more prominent in the case of the Gentiles to whom no such promise had come. (3) The form *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*, instead of *εἰς τὸν Χριστόν*, is not against this view: "to have hoped *in Christ* was a higher characteristic than to have directed hope *towards Christ*, and designated them as more worthy exponents of the praise of God's glory" (ELLICOTT).—If this view be accepted, then we can with propriety retain the article in translating: *in the Christ*, as indeed BRAUNE himself insists on the emphatic force of the article in the similar phrase, ver. 10. Any emphasis upon it here would tell against his view.—R.]

THIRD FOUNDATION. Vers. 13, 14: *The personal appropriation of salvation.*

Ver. 13. **In whom ye also.**—*Ἐν ᾧ*, in Christ, *viz.*, "ye were sealed," since the repetition of *ἐν ᾧ* is justified by the added phrase: "after that ye heard," *etc.* Comp. WINER, p. 545, 1. [For a capital defence of this view of the construction, see ELLICOTT *in loc.*—R.] Evidently neither *ἐστέ* (MEYER) [ALFORD], nor *ἠλπίκατε* (ERASMUS, CALVIN, BEZA [E. V., ESTIUS] and others), nor *ἐκληρώθητε* (ANSELM, KOPPE, HARLESS, OLSHAUSEN)* should be supplied. The last is manifestly too remote, the second could only be *προηλπίκατε*, and the first is unnecessary. It is impossible to take the participle *ἀκούσαντες* as a finite verb (*Syriac*, LUTHER: have heard) [*i. e.*, as the predicate of *ὑμεῖς*]; just as little should *ἐν ᾧ* be explained as *ideo* (MORUS).

"Ye also" refers to the readers, and places them in antithesis to "we:" that is, the Christians specially addressed, the local church, written to, over against Christendom in general, the church as a whole. There is no ground whatever for the reference to Gentile Christians, which is accepted by nearly all modern expositors, except RUECKERT; nor does the context justify it. [See my note on ver. 12. The passage is markedly antithetical, and this is a ground for the reference to the Gentile Christians. As for the context: while hearing and

* [ELLICOTT objects to this as inexact, observing that "this would imply a participle *without*, not as here *with* the article." He refers to DONALDSON, *Cratylus*, § 304, *Grammar*, § 492 sq. It should be noticed that the perfect participle expresses here as so often a past act continuing to the present, the perfect of *permanent state.*—R.]

† [It should be noticed, that DE WETTE, who is the principal supporter of this view, is also the chief opposer of the Pauline origin of our Epistle. Naturally enough the latter opinion would influence his judgment on this point, for one who believes that this verse was written by a pupil of the Apostle Paul, in all probability a Gentile, would fail to see the appropriateness of giving prominence to the antithesis between Jewish and Gentile Christians accepted by most commentators.—R.]

* [So HODGE, who misapprehends the difficulties attending the construction accepted by BRAUNE.—R.]

believing and sealing belong to all Christians, there was undoubtedly in the previous circumstances of the Gentile Christians, a good reason for emphasizing these facts in their case.—R.]

Having heard the word of truth, *ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας*.—This points to the external situation, in which the apostolic preaching came to them, and they accepted it. This is by no means a token that they are Gentile Christians (STIER, SCHENKEL and others), but is chiefly applicable rather to the Jews. (Acts xiii. 46, xviii. 5, 6; Rom. i. 16; xv. 8).* That which is imparted, "the word of truth," is so termed on account of its contents (2 Tim. ii. 15), as it is called "of God," on account of its origin (Acts xiii. 46); "of life," 1 Jno. i. 1, on account of its *effect*. In Col. i. 6: "in the word of the truth of the Gospel" (comp. Gal. ii. 5: "the truth of the gospel") the shading of the thought is somewhat different; here the reference is less to the antithesis in Judaism (the "shadow" of the O. T.), as CHRYSOSTOM, STIER think, or to that in heathenism with its lies (A-LAPIDE and others), or to both (GROTIUS), than to Christ, who is the Truth, so that the word as to its contents and origin is *τῆς ἀληθείας* (HARLESS, SCHENKEL [EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, HODGE] and others). But the phrase is never = *doctrina vera* (MORUS, KOPPE), *institutio in vera religione* (WAHL).

The gospel of your salvation, *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν*.—This is appositional, defining what precedes, and in such a way that "word" corresponds to "gospel," "truth" to "salvation;" the latter word sets forth the power of saving, which is joined to the gospel, which operates through it (Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 18; iv. 20); hence it is the contents to be imparted; "salvation" is more comprehensive than "forgiveness of sins," redemption (ver. 7); it is "the certain, complete rescuing" STIER). [ELLICOTT distinguishes between the two genitives; taking *ἀληθείας* as genitive *substantiæ*, *σωτηρίας* as "a genitive of the (spiritual) *contents* or *subject-matter, etc.*, 'the gospel which turns upon, which reveals salvation,' thus forming one of that large class of genitives of remoter reference."—R.]

In whom I say having also believed, ye were sealed [*ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσφραγίσθητε*]. *Ἐν ᾧ*, "in whom," stands in the *anaphora* and, as in the beginning of this verse and in ver. 11, refers to Christ; this is required by *καὶ πιστεύσαντες*, since *καί* connects with the preceding *ἀκούσαντες*: "the inward state of being permeated by the word of truth is expressed by the advance from *ἀκούσαντες* to *καὶ πιστεύσαντες*, they have heard it and at the same time really appropriated it" (MATTHIES); hence both words have the same reference. Although it is grammatically allowable that *ἐν ᾧ* be connected with *πιστεύσαντες* and applied to the gospel (Mark i. 15; *πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*); yet as a matter of syntax it should be referred to *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ* (ver. 12) which is dialectically justified at the same time, because the vital fellowship with Christ is the pre-supposition for the *σφραγισθῆναι*, and faith is only the condition, the subjective means of appropriation. "Not *in virtue* of faith, but *by means* of faith in virtue of what the word proffers to him who hears and what he apprehends" (DELITZSCH), comes the new life in Christ.

Πιστεύσαντες may be understood, as in Rom. xiii. 11 of the act of acceptance (RUECKERT), or taken as = *διὰ τῆς πίστεως*, as in ver. 7: *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ*; iii. 12: *διὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ*. Comp. Rom. v. 2; 1 Cor. iv. 15. [It is best taken absolutely.—R.] We may then say with HARLESS: the notion of the participle as to its temporal occurrence coincides with that of the finite verb. MEYER ought not to separate and sever temporally hearing, believing, baptism, reception of the Holy Ghost, although dialectically they are to be sharply distinguished.

[These aorist participles may express either contemporaneous or antecedent action. The latter relation seems to be most in accordance with the nature of the actions referred to. ALFORD takes them as indicating the *terminus a quo*, rendering: *since*, from the time when *ye* heard, *on your believing*, remarking further that the participle is and is not contemporaneous with the verb: "it is not, inasmuch as in strict accuracy, faith preceded baptism, and baptism preceded the gift of the Spirit: but it is, inasmuch as on looking back over a man's course, the period of the commencement of his faith includes all its accidents and accompaniments."—R.]

Ἐσφραγίσθητε is more closely defined by the context. It means in iv. 30; John iii. 33; vi. 27; 2 Cor. i. 22, to seal, to confirm, as *σφραγίς* (Rom. iv. 11; 1 Cor. ix. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 19) is the attesting seal. By means of the faith which is joined with your hearing, ye have been also sealed and certified in Christ; referring to ver. 11: *ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐκληρώθημεν*. The *κληρωθῆναι* moves on to the *σφραγισθῆναι* (CHRYSOSTOM); it is not evident, how this should be particularly true of the Gentile Christians, over against the Jewish Christians, among whom Paul reckoned himself.* There is not merely an intended inheritance and an attestation thereto conceded, but this is presented with a certifying seal; since the heritage is in them, they in it, and it growing into them, they are themselves made sure as heirs, are confirmed and certified in this possession. The immediate meaning is, that they have been assured of this grace for themselves; "ye have been assured by the Holy Ghost, as by a letter and seal" (RUECKERT).

The change of person (*ἡμεῖς—ὑμεῖς*) marks, that they have been *attested* in this possession for others also, strongly enough *designated*, to be recognized as companions. [This is equally true, if "we," "you," be referred to Jewish and Gentile Christians, for it was precisely the gift of the Holy Ghost (Acts x. 47; xi. 17), which demonstrated to Peter, that the Gentiles should be thus recognized.—R.] THEOPHYLACT: *ὥστε εἶναι δῆλον, ὅτι θεοῦ ἐστε λάχος καὶ κλῆρος.*)

* [It is difficult to see how these passages prove the correctness of Dr. BRAUNE's statement. The Jews were the first hearers, but of the *ὑμεῖς* "believing" also is here predicated, the reference being to the same persons; hence these passages which speak of the Jews hearing and not believing, prove rather that *ὑμεῖς* refers to Gentile Christians.—R.]

* [The sealing was the same in the case of both, but the antecedents of the Gentile Christians, the fact that they had no previous seal of God's covenant, makes this prominent in their case, but this does not require us to find here any definite allusion to circumcision.—R.]

It is only a sequel and an inference, that they have been *secured* from future wrath, ruin, loss and condemnation.* The passive indicates an experience, which does not proceed from themselves, is not developed out of them, but is the act of another, of God. All this is so natural and so accordant with the use of the word, which is a common one in the Old Testament, that there is no reason for supposing here an allusion to heathen customs, such as branding slaves with the name of their master (FLATT), or the *stigmata* of idolatrous worship (GROTIUS), or, because the letter is addressed to Ephesus, to the σφραγίς of Diana (AMETIUS), or to Jewish circumcision (SCHOETTGEN, WETSTEIN, THOLUCK and others). Nor is it equivalent to: the salvation or inheritance (in RUECKERT) is sealed to you; since they themselves are attested documents.

With the Spirit of promise, the holy One [τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ].—The dative τῷ πνεύματι, marks that with which they have been sealed, certified; iv. 30; ἐν ᾧ, wherein "ye are sealed unto the day of redemption," denotes the fellowship with the Holy Ghost. The Spirit is here the attesting "seal," that God affixes to those who in fellowship with Christ have heard His word and become believers: πιστεύσαντες designates the subjective means, τῷ πνεύματι the objective. In Rom. viii. 16, without the figure: "the Spirit beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." [*With* (E. V.) as indicating that the Holy Spirit is the seal, is preferable to *by* (ALFORD, ELLICOTT), which might imply that the Spirit was the Sealer; God is the Sealer, *we* are the sealed, the Spirit is the Seal.—R.]

The phrase τῷ ἁγίῳ compels us to accept a reference to the Holy Spirit; it is added with emphasis, so as to guard against the mistake, that the spirit inherent in the promise was meant.† But because τῆς ἐπαγγελίας is emphasized, it comes first; it is otherwise in John vii. 37: ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς. Comp. WINER, p. 488 f. Of course we cannot take it as referring to special miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost (GROTIUS, ESTIUS), as though only those thus endowed were assured of the adoption and inheritance. Nor does it refer to the *donum sanctificationis* (PELAGIUS, Romanists) since τῷ ἁγίῳ denotes, not the *effect*, but the *attribute* of the Spirit.

The genitive τῆς ἐπαγγελίας accordingly cannot possibly designate the promise as that in which the Spirit is immanent, inheres, but refers to that the object of which is the Spirit, *viz.*, the Holy Spirit. BENGEL is excellent: *per verbum promissus erat spiritus sanctus; dato igitur spiritu sancto, ii., qui credidere verbo, obsignati sunt; et qui spiritum sanctum habent, omnem promissionem sibi præstitum iri sciunt.* So most expositors: the *promised* Spirit.‡ "The promise of the Spirit" (Gal. iii. 14) is the promise which has the Spirit as its aim, or its object. The "promise" here should not, however, be limited to Christ's last words (Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4), as is done by BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS, nor yet to the Old Testament promises (Joel iii. 1-5; Isa. xxxii. 15; xliv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 25; xxxix. 29), as HARLESS supposes, following CHRYSOSTOM; it includes both what is prophetical and apostolical (Luke xxiv. 44-47). The context definitely decides against the view, that the Spirit brings the promise, or that the notion of a *testimonium reddere, obsignare* is found in the genitival connection (THEOPHYLACT [who, however, also gives this correct explanation: ὅτι ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας ἐδόθη.—R.] CALVIN, BEZA.)

Ver. 14. **Who is the earnest of our inheritance** [ὅς ἐστιν ἀῤῥαβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν].—Ὅς refers logically to τὸ πνεῦμα, marking its personality, which the Apostle has in mind, *constructio ad sensum*), as Matth. xxviii. 19: τὰ ἔθνη—αὐτούς; 2 John 2: τοῖς τέκνοις—οὕς. Comp. WINER, p. 133. [A better explanation of ὅς, than the *constructio ad sensum*, is that of its agreement in gender with ἀῤῥαβών. So MEYER, ALFORD, ELLICOTT. (See WINER, p. 157.) The last named remarks that "τὸ πνεῦμα in its most distinct personal sense is invariably used with the neuter relative."–R.] It is not to be referred to Christ (POLYCARP); that is too remote (WINER, p. 149) and the sense will not admit of it, since the Spirit is the ἀῤῥαβών; 2 Cor. i. 22: "Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts" (v. 5). From the Hebrew עֲרָבוֹן (Gen. xxxviii. 3, 17, 18, 20)=*pignus*,* there probably arose through the agency of Phœnician traders ἀῤῥαβών in Greek, *arrhabo* and *arrha* in Latin (without the *h* also), with the sense of "earnest-money," the beginning of the payment which should take place in full afterwards. Hence HESYCHIUS:=πρόδομα, CHRYSOSTOM: μέρος τοῦ παντός; JEROME: *Arrabo futuræ emtioni quasi quoddam testimonium et obligamentum datur.* It is=ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος, Rom. viii. 23.

What the Spirit promises to vouchsafe to us in the future, in eternity, is indicated by the genitive τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν, "of our inheritance." The inheritance which is the necessary consequence of sonship (Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iv. 7) is an eternal one (Gal. iii. 18; Heb. ix. 15; comp. v. 5; Col. iii. 24). Thus then believers obtain the certainty that they are heirs and have an inheritance in eternity, not through an assurance from without, but chiefly through the *reality of the possession*, not at once in its entire extent, but in an *earnest* (HARLESS). "Our" includes the Apostle, his readers and all Christendom (1 Cor. ii. 12), because it stands at the end of the paragraph, not Gentile and Jewish Christians (STIER, SCHENKEL and others.)

* [HODGE combines the three meanings: (1) To authenticate or confirm as genuine and true; (2) To mark as one's property; (3) To render secure.—R.]

† [MEYER well remarks that Paul wishes to give *emphatic and solemn* prominence to that by means of which the sealing takes place, and hence speaks with a corresponding pathos. This should be preserved in the English rendering as above (so ALFORD).—R.]

‡ [ELLICOTT: "The Spirit which came from, *i. e.*, was announced, by promise." EADIE: "The genitive is almost that of ablation." MEYER takes it as "a genitive of quality, designating the promise as a *characteristic* of the Holy Spirit." ALFORD would retain the article in English: "the Spirit of the promise."—R.]

* [*Pignus*, pledge, differs from *arra*, earnest; the former is restored when the contract has been performed, the latter is a part of the purchase money. The custom of paying "earnest-money" obtains still in legal transactions, but more especially in the popular usage of most nations.—R.]

Unto the redemption of his purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory, *εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως, εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.*—These two qualifying phrases, introduced by the same preposition, are to be taken as parallel, the first referring to the *objective* aim of the church of God, the second to the *subjective* aim of the redeemed member (SCHENKEL). Comp. vers. 6, 12. Hence *αὐτοῦ* is to be joined to *περιποιήσεως* as well as to *δόξης* (MEYER, HOFMANN), who however in *Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 28, understands it of Christ, when it obviously refers to God the Father, (SCHENKEL). The preposition *εἰς* marks a goal, which is nearer at hand, more definitely described in the phrase "the earnest of our inheritance," than in "ye were sealed," so that the connection with the relative clause is more natural than to pass over it back to the verb of the main clause, ver. 13 (MEYER, [HODGE, ELLICOTT] and others). Thus the explanation of *ἀπολύτρωσις* as *ἡ τέλεια* is required. [That is, as in chap. iv. 30; Rom. viii. 23 (comp. my note *in loco*) the full final redemption, the accomplishment of all that is included in the word (ALFORD).—R.] The context, however, gives a further definition with *τῆς περιποιήσεως* (*αὐτοῦ.*)

Περιποιεῖν=to cause something to remain, to let remain, to deliver; *περιποιεῖσθαι*, to cause to remain for one's self, hence to acquire, to gain. The substantive therefore=acquisition, possession. In 2 Thess. v. 9: *εἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας*; 2 Thess. ii. 14: *εἰς περιποίησιν δόξης*, it is acquisition as the genitives indicate; 1 Pet. ii. 9: *λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν*, it is evidently possession (comp. Matth. iii. 17; Acts xx. 28; Isa. xliii. 21), hence=סְגֻלָּה as the people of Israel were termed, which is elsewhere designated by *περιούσιος* (Exod. xix. 5; Deut. vii. 6; xiv. 2; xxvi. 18, *λαὸς περιούσιος*, LXX. and Tit. ii. 14), *peculium Dei.* Hence the "redemption" applies to God's possession, to the people already acquired by Him, and cannot be the first redeeming act, "the forgiveness of sins" (ver. 7; Col. i. 14; Rom. iii. 24), by which the people are acquired, but must be the completed work, to which the Holy Ghost, as earnest, pledge, points and leads. So most expositors from THEOPHYLACT (*οἵ τινές ἐσμεν περιποίησις καὶ κτῆσις καὶ περιουσία θεοῦ*) and ŒCUMENIUS (*διὰ τὸ περιποιήσασθαι ἡμᾶς τὸν θεόν*) to ERASMUS and the latest time. Hence *εἰς* is not=*ἕως*, *usque ad* (MORUS), nor *ἀπολύτρωσις*= *mors*, *liberatio a malo* (MORUS), nor is the genitive *τῆς περιποιήσεως* a designation of the effect (LUTHER: to our redemption, that we become His possession; STIER: to the redemption, *that* we *become* and *because* we *are* His possession.)

[It rarely occurs that a passage presenting a number of difficulties is interpreted with so great an approach to unanimity as in this case. Modern English and American commentators, almost without an exception take the same view as BRAUNE. STIER, among the Germans, does not reject it, but puts other meanings upon the passage as usual. EADIE gives his Trinitarian division as follows: "The Father seals believers, and His glory is the last end; in the Son they are sealed, and their redemption is His work; while the Spirit 'which proceedeth' from the Father, and is sent by the Son—is the Seal and Earnest."—For a very full discussion of the word *περιποίησις*, see HARLESS, whose comments have largely contributed in producing the unanimity respecting this passage among modern interpreters.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The importance of the doctrine of predestination.* The Apostle speaks in great emotion, as is unmistakably shown by the remarkably complicated structure of his sentences, and with special emphasis, as the repetition and strength of his expressions (vers. 4, 5, 9, 11) equally prove. CHEMNITZ says, in a sermon on Matth. xxii. (in FRANK'S *Theologie der Form. Concord.*, iv. 268): "Therefore (on account of the contests arising out of the doctrine of election) it has occurred to some, that we ought not to preach at all to Christians in the church about the foreknowledge and choice of God, because it is dangerous to both sides, as it is said, leading either to security or despair; but because God has revealed this very doctrine to us so often and in so many parts of the Scripture, we must not put it under the table, may not and should not say, that it is unprofitable, obnoxious or injurious, yet we must so look into it, as not to run too far or climb too high, but have and hold in all simplicity the true understanding and proper use thereof." [It may well be added, that such use is for Christians alone (ver. 5: "us"), and that this use will lead on the one hand to trustful security in view of the fixedness of God's purpose, on the other hand to profound humility in view of the entire freedom of God's choice irrespective of our merit. Others may, nay some must speculate on this subject, but they find no solution of this problem save so far as God's word gives one; and this solution can be fully apprehended only by a believing soul; it is above logic and philosophy, and even technical theology, even as on many subjects, and these the most important, the heart is a better teacher than the head. Still even the most advanced Christian, seeing that God's word alone gives *any* solution, may well say with the martyr Ridley: "In these matters I am so fearful, that I dare not speak further; yea almost none otherwise than the text does, as it were, lead me by the hand" (from EADIE).—R.]

2. *The starting-point.* It must by no means be overlooked, that the Apostle first expresses in praise the *consciousness of salvation*, though in a summary way, and then passes to *predestination.* Even the transition ("even as he chose us") does not place predestination in the first rank; it only marks the actual relation, and that the possession of salvation becomes our portion according to the election and fore-ordination; yet it still remains true, that from the consciousness of salvation we should look into the eternal will of God, and be lifted up to it. This is done in the confession of the *Lutheran* church, *Form. Concord.*, article xi. In that symbol we begin with sin and the natural powers of man (i. ii.), then follows Justification and its consequences (iii. iv.), next the means of grace in the Word

and the Lord's Supper (v. vi. vii.); to these are joined the Christological articles (viii. ix.), and *De ceremoniis ecclesiasticis* (x.) seems to form the conclusion. But last of all there is added further: *De æterna prædestinatione et electione Dei.* See FRANK, *Theologie*, i. 48; iv. 188. The *Reformed* in their confessions (*Basle, Belgic, Westminster, Helvetic* and others) proceed from the speculative *idea of God*, which is neither Pauline, biblical, nor advisable. [This objection as regards abstractness does not hold against the *Heidelberg Catechism*. Still the Lutheran symbols go to the opposite extreme. That the order in the Reformed confessions is Pauline, Dr. Braune unconsciously admits in the order he himself adopts in these notes (ver. 4 follows ver. 3 very closely, be it observed). If it be Pauline, it is Scriptural, though this Apostle is not alone in putting God and His will so prominently in advance. As to its advisableness: some minds demand the Reformed order, which is at all events that of logical statement, of systematic theology. Others object to it, but the great difficulty is not met by any change of position. If we claim that believing hearts, "blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ," alone are competent for the discussion, we have claimed all that our section warrants us in doing. Let each systematize as he will; we cannot make God's truth dependent on the order of our symbols. Let us be charitable, since some minds are so constituted as to accept or even demand Calvinism, and others prefer to take the difficulty in another form. Let each hold, indeed, that God's truth is objective truth independent of our subjective statements, and hope for the time when a higher synthesis will reconcile what seems now to be contradictory, all the more because neither Calvinism nor Arminianism has solved the problem presented in this chapter, though one may in its efforts embrace more of the facts of the rule of grace and providence than the other. Comp. the *Doctr. Notes* on Rom. ix. in the Bible-work —R.]

3. *The object of the predestination* is set forth in "us" (vers. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14) and "you" (ver. 13), and in such a way that no ground for the predestination is to be found in those predestinated, hence nothing indicates a limitation of it. It is rather to be extended as widely as sin reaches, and the "forgiveness of sins" (ver. 7) is necessary, and the hearing of "the word of truth, the gospel of salvation" (ver. 13) is designed to extend. Hence the whole human race is the object of the predestination, and as the words "we" and "you" require, not in a mass, but down to each individual. This is entirely in accordance with 1 Tim. ii. 4 (*πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι*), with the Lord's word, John iii. 16 (*ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον*), and the saying of Peter (2 Peter iii. 9: *μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι*). It is precisely the section before us which marks the Divine will of mercy as directed towards *all.* We must maintain the *universality of grace*, UNIVERSALIS VOLUNTAS DEI, *quod non tantum prædicatio pœnitentiæ, verum etiam promissio evangelii sit universalis, hoc est, ad omnes homines pertineat* (Form. Conc. xi. 28). The word *πάντας* (1 Tim. ii. 4) cannot be explained by *cujusvis status atque conditionis homines, tam illustres ac potentes in mundo, quam obscuros* (PISCATOR), neither can we understand under *κόσμον* (Jno. iii. 16) the elect, on the ground that God never loved the damned (BEZA), nor limit *πάντας* (2 Pet. iii. 9) by *nempe credentes* (PISCATOR). Thus the Form. Conc. (xi. 23); *et quidem Deus illo suo consilio—non tantum in genere salutem suorum procuravit, verum etiam* OMNES ET SINGULAS PERSONAS *electorum—præscivit—eligit* (comp. *ibid.* § 54). The Lutheran confession, it is true, besides the *universality of the grace* of God notes also with a reference to this section a *particularity* of the *election* of grace, of which not all, good and bad, are the objects, but only the children of God: ÆTERNA *vero* ELECTIO *seu* PRÆDESTINATIO DEI AD SALUTEM *non simul ad bonos et ad malos pertinet, sed tantum ad filios Dei, qui ad æternam vitam consequendam electi et ordinati sunt, priusquam mundi fundamenta jacerentur* (xi. 5). Accordingly we should reject here the double predestination to salvation and damnation, which from the first was taught by LUTHER and MELANCHTHON (following AUGUSTINE, who, however, expressed himself very prudently and only in an infra-lapsarian sense, and GOTTSCHALK in the ninth century with his *duplex sive gemina prædestinatio*), but in an infralapsarian sense, maintained however by ZWINGLE (see HAHN, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1837, pp. 765–805) and CALVIN in a supralapsarian sense, and revived by the *Jansenism* of the Catholic Church in the 17th century, and by E. W. KRUMMACHER in our day, and also the doctrine of SAMUEL HUBERS, that God has in His Son ordained and elected each and every man to eternal life (see FRANK, iv. pp. 165, 281 ff., HAGENBACH in *Herzog's Real-Enc.*, vi. p. 293 ff.), a doctrine which SCHLEIERMACHER *repeats* in his discussion of the doctrine of election (*Werke Theol.* ii. p. 393 f) and in his *Glaubenslehre* (§ 119, 2), and also the view of HOFMANN (*Schriftbeweis*, i. p. 257 ff.), followed by LUTHARDT (*Compendium der Dogmatik*, p. 85), which denies the reference of the decree of grace to a definite number. [Dr. Braune seems to avoid a definite statement. Whatever may be deduced from the other passages referred to, Paul here declares that *individual persons* are chosen by God, predestinated unto adoption. How many those persons are is a question which when asked of the Son of God led only to personal exhortation. Who they are, manifests itself only in the exercise of faith, though even this is not always manifest to others (nor, as in the case of infants, is this a decisive test). Practically, the question is respecting our personal appropriation of the blessings of redemption, which are according as (*καθώς*, ver. 4) the election. Logically and theologically, the fact that some are partakers of blessing and others not, when taken in connection with the statement of vers. 4, 5, leads to the conclusion, that of God's free will some have been chosen and others *not chosen.* The negation is, however, all that any ought to deduce from our passage. The difficulties arising from this conclusion cannot be fully met save by a heart so trustful in its affection to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, as to know it to be right because He has so ordered. The same difficulty meets us in God's providential dealings, aye, in the workings of

His natural laws, for as a brilliant author has well said: "Nature is a terrible Calvinist." Paul concerns himself here only with the positive side, which presents but one difficulty, viz. that of fully responding in love to the gracious fact.—R.]

4. The *Subject of the predestination is God*, the Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (ver. 3), and that, too, in His "love" (ver. 4) according to "the good pleasure of His will" (vers. 5, 9), or "the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His will" (ver. 11); reference being made to His "grace" (ver. 11), and "the mystery of His will" (ver. 9) being recognized as the subject of the revelation. A duplex state in God Himself is by no means indicated, but rather excluded. In Him there are not two wills, one revealed, according to which God wills the salvation of all men, and another secret (*occulta illa et metuenda voluntas Dei ordinantis suo consilio, quos et quales prædicatæ et oblatæ misericordiæ capaces et participes esse velit*), nor do His mercy and justice exist merely *beside* each other, the latter respecting the damned and the former the elect. It is not that God is gracious, and at the same time just, or just and yet gracious, but in that He provides a satisfaction for His justice, He is gracious, and because He will satisfy His grace, He appeases His justice, so that justice as satisfied is the ground of grace, and grace as to be satisfied is the ground for the satisfaction of justice (FRANK, iv. 191). The secret will is not here asserted beside the revealed, nor can the secret will detract aught from the revealed; the latter, "as the real, unlimitedly efficient" will, stands "constantly over against the apparently contradicting secret" will and "conditions and controls" "the reality of the secret will." "A secret will *in abstracto*, not having at the same time in itself as substantial elements the substantial determinations of the revealed will, does not exist" (FRANK, iv. pp. 198–200). "The Scriptures, however, teach, that the Providence of God has not such a manner and meaning as if a master cook determines he will strangle some of the pheasants lying before him and let others fly, a figure Gerson uses, but predestination comprises in itself *totum decretum redemptionis, vocationis, justificationis, gubernationis et glorificationis*, as Paul throughout the first chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians thus treats and expounds this doctrine in detail" (CHEMNITZ in FRANK). The omnipotence and executive energy of God is conditioned and bound by His will, by His Nature, as well as by the regulations He has Himself established, which will be spoken of hereafter (notes 6, 7, 8). It is not the Absolute in itself, nor yet the *purely Absolute One*, but the self-conditioning Unconditioned One. Accordingly the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confession distinguish from the *prædestinatio Dei ad salutem*, taken as identical with the *electio*, the *præscientia Dei*, according to which He *prævidet et novit etiam mala, sed non ea ratione, quasi Dei voluntas propitia illa sit, ut fiant* (Form. Conc. xi. 6); *principium autem et causa mali non sit ipsa Dei præscientia, Deus enim non creat, procurat, efficit aut operatur malum, sed neque illud juvat aut promovet* (*Ibid* 7).

[The theory of the self-conditioning of God is a favorite one with many German theologians. Such self-conditioning may be assumed as the basis of creation, especially the creation of free moral agents, but the mystery yet remains: an Almighty God from whose freedom none of His creatures dare detract aught, and moral, yet sinful, men, from whose freedom of will God will detract nothing. If foreknowledge be assumed as the basis of the predestination, the difficulty is increased: "If God foresaw this faith and holiness, then these qualities were either self-created, or were to be bestowed by Himself; if the former, the grace of God is denied, and if the latter, the question turns upon itself—what prompted God to give them the faith and holiness which He foresaw they should possess" (EADIE). Braune only hints at this explanation, however. Sir WM. HAMILTON's "Philosophy of the Unconditioned" encounters the problem* as directly as Calvinism. Assuming as we must that "God's grace fits men for heaven, but men by unbelief prepare themselves for hell," we still insist: that St. Paul here teaches the entire freedom of choice on the part of God, that choice being in accordance with the nature of the Sovereign Chooser; and at the same time in ver. 13 assumes the free faith on the part of those addressed, while the state of blessing which moves his thanksgiving is expressly said to be in accordance with the choice of God. So much a fair exegesis allows, as Dr. Braune himself admits in his exegetical notes. "Whether this doctrine be identified with Pagan Stoicism or Mohammedan fatalism, and be rudely set aside, and the world placed under the inspection of an inert omniscience; or whether it be modified as to its end, and be declared to be privilege, and not holiness; or as to its foundation, and that be alleged to be not gratuitous and irrespective choice, but foreseen merit and goodness; or as to its subjects, and they be affirmed to be not individuals, but communities; or as to its result, and it be reckoned contingent, and not absolute; or whether the idea of election be diluted into mere preferential choice:"—"such hypotheses leave the central difficulty still unsolved, and throw us back on the unconditioned and undivided sovereignty of Him 'of whom, to whom, and through whom are all things,'—all whose plans and purposes wrought out in the Church, and designed to promote His glory, have been conceived in the vast and incomprehensible solitudes of His own eternity."—EADIE.—R.]

5. *The end of the predestination* is defined in a threefold way:

a. *For the predestinated:* "unto adoption" (ver.

* [EADIE, whose notes on this subject are as judicious as they are apt, quotes from Sir Wm. Hamilton (*Discussions*, etc. p. 598): "It is here shown to be as irrational as irreligious, on the ground of human understanding, to deny, either, on the one hand, the fore-knowledge, predestination, and free grace of God, or, on the other, the free will of man; that we should believe both, and both in unison, though unable to comprehend even either apart. This philosophy proclaims with *St. Augustine*, and Augustine in his maturest writings: —'If there be not free grace in God, how can He save the world? and if there be not free will in man, how can the world by God be judged?' (*Ad Valentinum Epist.* 2.4.) Or, as the same doctrine is perhaps expressed even better by *St. Bernard:* 'Abolish free will and there is nothing to be saved: abolish free grace, and there is nothing wherewithal to save.' (*De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio.*)" See the list of authors of all opinions given by EADIE, pp. 28, 29.—R.]

5), in which "redemption, the forgiveness of sins" (vers. 7, 14) are given to them in grace ("His grace which He freely bestowed upon us," ver. 6), so that they as the "possession" of God (ver. 14) become partakers of the inheritance (ver. 11), of the salvation which the gospel brings (ver. 13) and "holy and without blame" (ver. 4).

b. *For the entire world*, in the history of which through various periods of development ("dispensation of the fulness of times," ver. 10), it is accomplished: "to gather up together all things in Christ."

c. *For God the Lord:* "unto the praise of the glory of His grace" (ver. 6), "unto the praise of His glory" (vers. 12, 14). The aim is accordingly as much *moral* as *religious*, and as much *individually-personal* as *world-historical*. The synthesis of the moral and religious factors, which is in the main peculiar to the Sacred Scriptures (SCHENKEL), appears all the more prominently here, as the emphatic *εἰς ἔπαινον* is at once both religious and moral. The same is true of the glory of God and the blessedness of man, and so much so that it is not correct to affirm that the glory of God and it alone is "the final and most exalted end of the creation and redemption of the world" (SCHENKEL).

What is world-historical must be combined with what is personal, the individual life with the whole; it is however unmistakable, that the relation of the creature to the Creator is arranged in order to regulate the demeanor of the former, and that the whole is wrought upon by the individual parts becoming the object of activity, as these are wrought upon through the whole, and thus the totality is brought to completion.

6. *The Mediator is Christ*, "our Lord and Saviour" (ver. 3), "the Beloved" (ver. 6), and it is "through His blood" (ver. 7) thus in conformity to His eternal *Person* and His relation to God, as well as according to His atoning and redeeming *sufferings* in time. *Æterna igitur prædestinatio in Christo et nequaquam extra mediatorem Christum consideranda est* (Form. Conc. xi. 65). Since then God, who is the Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the Beloved, formed the decree of redemption in Christ, He must be conceived of as existing before the purpose, and hence the Person of Christ as that eternal person, in whom the Father chose us, as He created us in Him despite the foreseen fall. Accordingly Christ is the *causa meritoria* of our election, both of the purpose and its accomplishment, to which latter the suffering of death, mentioned in ver. 7, especially refers. Although the Reformed agree with the Lutherans in formal statement on this point, all their symbols describing the election of grace as taking place *in Christo* and *propter Christum*, yet they deviate from scriptural truth, in regarding Him as the object of the predestination: *ut ipse quoque ἐκλεκτός* (Helvet. Conf. V.), and not as *fundamentum ipsam electionem præcedens*, not as *causa meritoria*. So that they not only refer with *propter Christum* to the idea of satisfaction, which should not be the *causa impulsiva*, rather merely the condition chosen by God for the actualization of the predestination in eternal blessedness, but also with *in Christo* wish to designate only the medium of the accomplishment. According to this view only for those elected by God's mercy is there a Christ and an atoning death, and it cannot be perceived whence there should then arise any necessity of the atoning act of redemption for the satisfaction of Divine wrath; for the grace has not to be rendered possible, but the determined gracious purpose has only to be carried out. Comp. SCHNECKENBURGER, *Vergleichende Darstellung*, I. p. 192 ff.; FRANK, IV. p. 192 ff. [It is scarcely fair to take the strongly partisan work of HEIDEGGER (*Formula Consensus Helvetica*, 1675, see *Biblework*, Romans, pp. 191, 192) as a representative of the Reformed Confessions on this point. There has been, since the days of the Reformation, a tendency in the Reformed Church to bald forensic statements on this point, but to-day the full significance of the phrase: "in Christ," is perhaps better understood than ever before.—R.]

7. *The means of grace* in carrying out the decree of redemption the Apostle indicates with *γνωρίσας*, "having made known" (ver. 9), and calls them also: "the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation" (ver. 13). To neither designation of the Divine word is there attached any limitation as respects the sphere of its effect, while the genitives describe rather, partly ("of truth") an efficient truth, calculated for all, as the purport of this word, partly ("of your salvation") the power and effect, which it bears in itself and exercises. At all events we should maintain, as respects this chapter, what is said in the *Form. Conc.* xi. 16, 29, 33 (where the German version has "*verleiht*," the Latin expressing it more weakly: *largiri vult*, though meaning quite as much): For it should not be thought, that God spoke thus: Externally through the word I call all of you, to whom I give my word, into my kingdom, but in my heart I do not intend it for all, but only for a certain few; for it is my will, that the greater part of those whom I thus call through my word should not be enlightened and converted, but be and remain condemned, although I declare otherwise respecting them in the invitations of my word. "*Hoc enim esset Deo contradictorias voluntates affingere*" (xi. 24). [This is the old difficulty in another form. It is a difficulty of fact, too. For a large portion of those who have the word of God in their hands and hear it, even while it is the Gospel of salvation to those who sit beside them, are "not enlightened and converted." Why not? The question is not a merely theoretical one, but comes out of agonized hearts often enough. An answer which charges God with folly, or which accepts His purpose as thwarted, will not satisfy the heart, however theologians may philosophize; the resting place in this strait, as in all others, is in God. "He worketh all things after the counsel of His will"—but is "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."—R.]

8. *The condition* of the saving effect of these means the Apostle marks with *ἀκούσαντες*, to which he adds with emphasis *καὶ πιστεύσαντες* (ver. 13), and with *προηλπικότας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*. The Formula of Concord aptly states these thoughts (xi. 17): *Decrevit etiam se spiritu sancto*

suo per verbum annuntiatum auditione perceptum et memoriæ commendatum velle in nobis efficacem esse, et corda ad veram pœnitentiam agendam inflectere et vera fide conservare. There is at least nothing to be derived from these propositions in favor of the *Synergism* of Melanchthon and his followers. The word of God develops in the hearer that power which he has placed in it, and in this power he apprehends, being himself first apprehended, what is bidden him, and thus gains hope and confidence through the power of the word which has become vital and active in him. But it is indicated definitely enough that man can resist; he is not forced to hear and accept what is proclaimed, nor to believe in it and hope in it. Since God will save only in Christ, and only through the Word will create faith and hope in Him, this does not accord with the statement of the Reformed and the Predestinarians, that God wills nothing which He does not do. If the Ninevites could avert His punitive will by repentance, so His gracious will may be thwarted through resistance. This is Scriptural truth, and it is confirmed by Christian experience, which knows of no necessity for obeying the will of God, but too well of a possibility of resisting it (FRANK, IV. p. 205). The *gratia irresistibilis* of AUGUSTINE is a fiction arising from an abstract conception of the purely Absolute. The unconditioned yet self-conditioning Personality of God does not will, as the predestinarians think that He wills, but with a self-restraining almightiness within the sphere of redemption, so that salvation is not gained without His will, but the proffered salvation is lost through man's own fault against His earnest gracious will, which He offers in His Word. Both must be maintained: God has willingly given men of His will and conditioned Himself, in placing conditions before men in the hearing and believing of His Word, and man has the power of continued resistance, so that an entire *apocatastasis* of all things, the ultimate salvation of all, although God's revealed will points thereto, is scarcely conceivable, as ORIGEN, SCHLEIERMACHER and others suppose. A final resistance is to be maintained as possible. NITZSCH, *System*, p. 416.

9. *Assurance of election* is definitely pointed out in vers. 13, 14: "ye were *sealed* with the Spirit of *promise*, the Holy One, who is the earnest of our inheritance," and although in consequence of faith (πιστεύσαντες), still on the ground of the promise of the Holy Ghost and the resulting bestowal of the same—in the means of grace, the word, and baptism (which, though not expressed, is to be understood) and through which Christ's merit, that is and suffices for all, is attributed to us. On the ground of the certainty, that God's word is true, that God has loved the *world*, that Christ has died for the sins of the *whole* world, and that God has called you also, *must* have called you, because He has loved you in Christ, and I have been baptized, accepted as a child, endowed with the Holy Ghost, renewed, regenerated, even though it be but germinally, potentially, I am certain of my election before the foundation of the world, and my inheritance in eternity. [Rightly enough the doctrine of election is for the comfort of believers, but they will derive far more comfort from a more definite conception of the matter. If "baptismal regeneration" is a ground for the assurance of election, then many thus assured are not sanctified in this world, and such an assurance is not likely to further such a result. The Augustinian view is here the practical one.—R.]

10. *The possibility of apostasy* is indicated by the phrase "unto the redemption of the purchased possession." It marks chiefly the goal to which the Holy Ghost, as "earnest of our inheritance," points. But the Christian has the consciousness, that his life-development is an ethical, not a physical, process, that he can withdraw himself, can resist the Divine will, can fall and fall away too. God *will* preserve us to the end and complete His work on and in us, *si modo non ipsi nos ab eo avertamus* (*Form. Conc.*, xi. 32, 75). Hence the warnings in the hortatory part of this Epistle (chap. iv.–vi). Comp. Heb. vi. 4–6, where the fall of the regenerate is assumed, and only the return of such is called impossible. Accordingly there inheres in the reference to election and the possession of salvation a strong means of incitement to sanctification, on the ground and in virtue of the existing ethical matter of fact in *faith*. [An "earnest" is generally a safeguard against failure to fulfil the agreement, nor does the preposition εἰς (ver. 14), rendered "until" in the E. V., indicate any possibility of failure, but rather with its strong final sense, and that too in parallelism with "unto the praise of his glory," implies the very opposite. The doctrine of the perseverance of the saints stands or falls with that of personal predestination, and both are parts of the theological system, which makes "His glory" the chief end.—R.]

11. *Concluding remark.* A mystery remains here until eternity. It is analogous to a *miracle*, which is not such in the sight of God nor of the redeemed any longer, but only for those in lower stages. Thus it is with the mystery of God's will, which is ever dissolving and in the higher degrees of revelation becomes ever more manifest. The completion of revelation like that of the inheritance lies beyond this world. Hence we have not contradictions,* that inhere in the Scripture or the truth, but only those which belong to human statement, and are such to our understanding. Let us then be humble! [This is the best guard against dogmatism. Especially let those who hold those views of Divine Sovereignty which are most humbling learn the lesson!—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Begin always with thanksgiving to God, and neither forget nor overlook the benefits He has conferred upon you; but above all consider the spiritual gifts with which He has blessed you and yours.—The beginning, middle, and end of the Christian life, or its ground, path and goal, is the praise and adoration of God. Before God created men, He willed that they should be His children; it is just in being or becoming God's

* [The position to be taken is not that the future will reconcile propositions which *are* contradictory, but which *seem to be* contradictory, the whole question transcending the limits of human thought.—R.]

children, that we foster the human in us, and we should be Christians, in order to be really men. He who does not fully *become a man*, is no proper Christian or child of God. The ultimate end of God is His glory; this is attained, when we become holy and blameless. He wills His glory only in our blessedness; the Father's honor is linked with the children's blessedness.—Everything is to be *traced* back to the will of God: what is manifest, revealed, experienced is the guide into the secrecy of God and His will; we must let ourselves be led from His revealed will into His secret will.—God accomplishes His will, but only according to the purpose of His will; hence not in a physical, chemical, "natural" process, but in an ethical life-process of men created after His image and for sonship with Him does He effect the desired and determined redemption of the same.—In Christ, the Beloved, is the counsel of salvation formed, in Christ it is to be carried out, and in such a way that Christ dies for the sake of sinners as a sacrifice of reconciliation, as an atoning sacrifice, and with the forgiveness of sins is begun that redemption, which leads to the throne and heart of God, since the Spirit of God works on our spirit, and His work not being in vain, confirms us in sonship, in regeneration and renewal even unto the inheritance. The process is from above to beneath, then from within to without, in order to lead from the depths up on high. The mystery of the Divine will is not in itself an incomprehensible, inconceivable enigma, entirely uncomprehended; it is only a mystery for us, rising so far above us, who cannot fathom its depth nor measure its infinitude, considering the majesty and the kindness of the same. For *our* reason it is a mystery; not *contrary to*, but above our reason; the reason of man and of God are two very different things. The mystery of the Divine will is only the manifestation of what is conditioned, limited, finite and imperfect in our knowledge, which bears to what in itself is clearest of all the same relation as the eyes of night birds to bright daylight. It is a proof of a *Divine* revelation, if we seem, when confronted with His will and truth, to be transferred to a shoreless sea, a fathomless depth. That is at once the mystery and the revelation of God. Without revelation knowest thou nothing of God, canst know nothing of Him; whoever rejects the revelation in Christ, in the sacred Scriptures, rejects also the science of God Himself; to him the mystery of God ever becomes a riddle without solution, while the Christian ever knows and feels it with greater joy. It is not unreasonable to believe on the mystery in God, since this disappears ever more and more; like children, we grow into the truth which was at first so mysterious.—As Christ is the point of beginning for the Father's gracious decree in eternity, so He is the middle-point of its accomplishment in history, and the terminal point in its consummation.—All things, the creation of heaven and earth, the maintenance and administration of the world are subordinate and subservient to the counsel of God's grace respecting our redemption in Christ: the Father is concerned for His children, not for His servants and His possessions; these are employed and rightly placed, when the children are cared for.—The word of revelation must be proclaimed and accepted: this is the chief duty of men ordered by God.—Here believers have no lack of germs, beginnings, earnest; but fruit, completion, full payment come not here, but above.

STARKE:—The wealth of the elect is inconceivable, indescribable, incomparable.—See the final point of this election of grace, and its tokens too. Prove yourselves thereby, ye Christians!—Believers have sonship with God through Christ, not from their own worthiness: it brings with it the noblest treasures, yes, the eternal inheritance.—The forgiveness of sins is the most glorious fruit of Christ's redemption; it is the basis of all other benefits: for where it is, there is life and blessedness.—The fountain of grace will never be drained, but is and remains inexhaustible, so that of its fulness we receive grace for grace.—Christ is the true ladder whose top touches heaven and its end the earth, thus linking and binding heaven and earth, God and men. Let him, who will be united to God, hold to Christ.—Angels and men stand again in friendship through Christ. Hence Christ is concerned with the angels, not that He must gain something for them of which they do not stand in need, but that they may have friendship again with men, when these again attain to grace.—The work of our election and salvation is full of wisdom, because it has taken place according to the counsel of Him who is wisdom itself; it is pure grace, because it appertains to an inheritance; infallible, because it is founded on the purpose of the Almighty; full of righteousness, because all comes to us through Christ, the righteous. Excellent tokens of the Divine truth of the Christian religion: it brings that with it, which the whole world cannot give and which makes man blessed, in the germ here in time, in perfection in eternity. This makes believers joyful in all tribulation, even in martyrdom.

RIEGER:—*They shall be blessed* is the sum of all the promises of the Old Testament; *He has blessed us* is the Gospel laud for the fulfilment of these promises in the New Testament. With these spiritual blessings in heavenly places the gospel conquers the whole world and the earthly mind, in which Jews and Gentiles lay captive.—In this are the honor of God and our salvation inseparably joined: God seeks His honor or the praise of His glory in us through our pardon.—In the Old Testament, it was often said: the Lord do thee good for Abraham's sake, for His servant David's sake; but now all is in and through the Beloved, who became the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. Once obtain in Him the forgiveness of sins, and then all other spiritual blessings flow without ceasing.—By the frequent phrase: according to His good pleasure, according to the counsel of His will, the Apostle bows down our mistrustful heart, so apt to strive for the mastery with the Holy One of Israel.—In the repeated expressions: through Himself, in whom, in Christ, the Apostle manifests an unusual zeal and care, to bind us ever to Christ, to accustom us to seek and find our glory in this alone, that we belong to Christ and are numbered in His inheritance; we may have reason hereafter to praise more the *truth* of God, like the

Jews, descending from the fathers, whose are the promises; or to magnify rather His mercy, like the *Gentiles*, who unexpectedly have been favored with the gracious call. It is *a word of truth*, searched by every one, who is of the truth, concerned about the truth, that thus he may be helped to the truth; it is *the Gospel of our salvation*, not only bringing us tidings of it, but containing a Divine power for actual blessing, through the faith to which it inclines the heart, giving also the Spirit, which affords what redounds to our own certainty and steadfastness in the truth, serving at the same time as a witness to others, that we have attained a position in true grace, and especially assuring us of our preservation, which we are to enjoy as the redeemed possession of the Lord, but which with the crown thereto appertaining we will lay at the feet of Him, who has accepted us to the praise of His glory.

BENGEL:—*Ultra hoc beneplacitum nobis neque in salutis nostræ neque in ullis operum divinorum causis rimandis ire licet. Quid philosopharis de mundo optimo? Cave, ne tute sis malus!*

KLEUKER:—The entire Pauline theology rests mainly on what he calls the *Divine mystery*, terming its execution the *economy* of God. No Apostle speaks with such a sweep and fulness of spirit, as Paul, whose revelation is in this economy.

GERLACH:—The riches of Divine grace in the forgiveness of sins makes itself known to us chiefly through the illumination, which thus becomes ours, the knowledge of God and our salvation,—this we include under *wisdom;* under *prudence* especially the insight into our condition and the life of the world, the practical, Christian wisdom for living. In neither should we think merely of the one-sided intellectual knowledge.

HEUBNER:—Christ, the eternal Son of God, has been the ground, why God created the world, and delivered and blessed the fallen world. Christ is the eternal ground of the Divine complacency toward the world, the ground of our blessedness.—The highest grace is Redemption. God decreed it, Christ accomplished it, earning it. It is of a purely spiritual character, the forgiveness of sins. That is true redemption, which releases us not from earthly need, but from anxiety and disquietude of conscience, from enmity to God, from incapacity for good and fear of hell. It is the fundamental condition of all other possessions, which we have through Christ. The *general* decree of God is the basis of the calling of individuals; for God overlooks no one. Man can bring either honor or shame to God, as a child to its parents. Christians should bring honor to God, He desires to get honor through us before the world.—The Holy Spirit is the seal of Christians, the stamp which they receive, that they are real children of God, the token by means of which they appear and pass current as Christians before the celestial spirits. Without this *character* ("express image") faith is vain and all Christianity mere sham. How many sham Christians there are, who have not this seal!—This Spirit is to the Christian the strongest proof also of eternal life, because in itself it is something eternal, imperishable.

PASSAVANT:—The eternal counsel of the Father respecting the election of souls is first carried out and consummated in the Son and through Him in the course of time. It is a work and miracle of love, unsearchable and unfathomable, carried on at once on earth and in heaven, in a human breast, and in a Divine heart. This election does not rest in man or angel, not in the will of man or angel's thought; not in human or angelic holiness or righteousness, purity or greatness or fidelity, not in any virtue, glory or love of the creature.—By nature we are not the children of God; even though so many may, flatly and godlessly enough, think and affirm otherwise, calling God Father and All-father.—But God now makes us His children; He has exalted us to the joys, the blessednesses, the treasures, the eternities, the glories of the heavenly nature; we are children, beloved children, heirs of God, heirs of heaven! This is the doing of the Lord's grace.—Nothing makes so poor in all true good and worth and blessing, as sin and all that belongs to and proceeds from sin.—The gospel traces our thoughts and feelings back to and into ourselves, so that we perceive the cunning of our hearts and the deceit of sin, and come to the footprints of God, to the springs of what is eternally true and good. It reveals to us, what we were, what we are, and what we should become; what are our deepest needs, the eternal ones; what our internal injury the worst of all; what our heaviest sorrows might be, here and hereafter. It reveals to us, where the true, certain aid is, where salvation, light, peace, life are, a Divine salvation, an unerring light, an eternal peace, an everlasting life.—It is out of this light, that its opponents and enemies have borrowed or stolen all the rays of truth and wisdom, which shine here and there in their proud writings and philosophies.—It is the Holy Spirit, who gives man to God in this life, and gives God to man in eternal life; who here sketches the features of the children in likeness to their heavenly Father, and will complete the picture in eternity: who begins their redemption here with their release from the servile yoke of the creature, and will complete it in the unity and love of the Creator.

STIER:—An Apostle *prays* for his church, *teaches* and *exhorts* out of the promise and petition of his apostolic prayer, but does not lord it, does not establish eternal forms, does not urge and carry to excess the external phenomena of the church, which is forming itself deeply and inwardly in view of its goal.—Each after his manner! As Christ is now our Head in another way than that of the holy angels, so is He in another way Lord and King, and *Crown*, too, of the material world also. The condemned and evil spirits lie at His *feet* in another manner than the adoring saints and angels—yet still all really, all finally before Him.

BEECHER*:—Those who are willing are always the elect, those who will not, are not elected. Many men are wrapped up in the doctrines of election and predestination, but that is the height of impertinence. They are truths

* [This is no doubt HENRY WARD BEECHER. Dr. Braune gives no further clue to the discovery of the original passage than the single word "Beecher," which might apply to any one of a large family. As this is the only American citation in any part of the volume, it is retained, even though at the disadvantage of being a translation of a translation.—R.]

belonging to God alone, and if you are perplexed by them, it is only because you trouble yourself about things which do not concern you. You only need to know that God sustains you with all His might in the winning of your salvation, if you will only rightly use His help. Whoever doubts this is like the crew of a boat working with all their might against the tide and yet going back hour after hour; then they notice, that the tide turns, while at the same time the wind springs up and fills their sails. The coxswain cries: pull away boys! wind and tide favor you! But they answer: What can we do with the oars, don't the wind and tide take away our free agency?

SCHELLING:—It is a *vacuity of ideas*, that ventures to call itself Rationalism. Not to hate one's enemies, not to persecute them, but to do them good, aye, to *love* them, is *above* Reason. The supreme commands of a generous morality, exalting humanity, could not be fulfilled, if man could not act *above* Reason. Why then should not God act above Reason? In this sense it is by no means irrational to say,—the will of God as respects the human race estranged from Him is *above* Reason. We can, with J. G. Haman, answer the good-natured people who want to have a rational God *after their notions:* whether they have never noticed, that God is a genius, *who asks very little about what they call rational or irrational.*

HOFACKER:—The wide range which Christmas Day opens to our eye of faith: 1) How *far back;* 2) How *high up;* 3) How *far ahead* it teaches us to look.

AHLFELD:—Thank the Lord, who hath blessed thee with all spiritual blessings in heavenly things! 1) *For what* should I be thankful? 2) *How* should I thank Him?—(Sermon for Whitsunday): The Holy Ghost, as Steward of the possessions of Christ, pours out His treasures upon us. He (1) *proclaims*, (2) *entails*, (3) *seals* to us salvation in Jesus Christ.

PALMER:—Our election in Christ: 1) It is an eternal one, but linked to the temporal Incarnation of Christ; 2) It is a mysterious act of God, but each may have a clear consciousness respecting it; 3) It has taken place without our help, but does not permit us to be idle.

KAPFF (on St. Thomas' Day):—What a mighty strengthening of our faith lies in the Divine election! 1) in its goal, 2) in its ground, 3) in the mode of its accomplishment.

[SCHENKEL:—The eternal election of the Christian: 1. A work of Divine love; 2. With the effect of presenting him ever more and more pure and holy before God.—Jesus Christ the Saviour of the world: He is (1) the Centre of the world's history, (2) the Key to the understanding of the mystery of God's providential rule.—How in the Person of Jesus Christ, beginning and end, heaven and earth harmoniously unite.—No predestination save unto holiness, no election outside of the Mediator, Jesus Christ.—All events in time depend on the decree of God in eternity.—The Holy Ghost as the earnest of our heavenly inheritance: 1. A balm of consolation for the weak; 2. A weapon of victory for the strong.—R.]

[EADIE:—Ver. 3. We bless Him because He has blessed us.—Christianity is the dispensation of the Spirit, and as its graces are inwrought by Him, they are all named "spiritual" after Him.—Ver. 4. The pulsation of a holy heart leads to a stainless life, and this is the avowed purpose of our election.—Sovereignty is but another name for highest and benignest equity.—Ver. 5. The returning prodigal does not win his way back into the paternal mansion. This purpose to accept us existed ere the fact of our apostacy had manifested itself, and being without epoch of origin, it comes not within the limits of chronology. It pre-existed time.—Adoption has its medium in Christ: but it has its ultimate enjoyment and blessing in God. Himself is our Father.—*His* household we enter—*His* welcome we are saluted with—*His* name and dignity we wear—*His* image we possess—*His* discipline we receive—and *His* home, secured and prepared for us, we hope forever to dwell in. To *Himself* we are adopted. The origin of this privilege and distinction is the Divine love.—Ver. 8. A mystery is not to be flung abroad without due discrimination. The revealer of it wisely selects his audience, and prudently chooses the proper time, place and method for his disclosure.—Ver. 10. This *re-capitulation* of all things is declared a second time to be in Christ—a solemn and emphatic re-assertion. His mediative work has secured it, and His mediatorial person is the one centre of the universe. As the stone dropped into the lake creates those widening and concentric circles, which ultimately reach the farthest shore, so the deed done on Calvary has sent its undulations through the distant spheres and realms of God's great empire.—Ver. 11. His desire and His decrees are not at variance, but every resolution embodies His unthwarted pleasure.—Ver. 13. The gospel is wholly truth, and that very truth which is indispensable to a guilty world. And it comes as a word, by special oral revelation, for it is not gleaned and gathered: there is a kind and faithful oracle.—The gospel is good news, and that good news is our salvation.—That seal unbroken remains a token of safety. Whatever bears God's image will be safely carried home to His bosom.—Ver. 14. The earnest, though it differ in degree, is the same in kind with the prospective inheritance. The earnest is not withdrawn, nor a totally new circle of possessions substituted. Heaven is but an addition to present enjoyments. The prelibation will be followed by the banquet.—"We have redemption" so soon as we believe; we are ever having it so long as we are on earth; and when Jesus comes again to finish the economy of grace, we shall have it in its full and final completion.—All issues "to the praise of His glory," His grace having now done its work. The church receives its complement in extent at the very same epoch at which it is crowned with fulness of purity and blessedness. "May it please Thee of thy gracious goodness shortly to accomplish the number of Thy elect, and to hasten Thy kingdom," is an appropriate petition on the part of all saints.—R.]

2. *Exhortation springing out of the Apostle's supplication for the Church as the body of Christ, who is the Head.*

(CHAP. I. 15–23.)

15 Wherefore [For this cause] I also, after I [having] heard of your faith [or the
faith which is among you] in the Lord Jesus, and love [the love which *ye have*][1]
16 unto all the saints, Cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you[2] in
17 my prayers; That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give
unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge [in full knowledge]
18 of him: The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; [Having the eyes of
your heart[3] enlightened,] that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and
19 [*omit* and][4] what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, And what
is [*omit is*] the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according
20 to the working of his mighty power [the might of his strength],[5] Which he [hath][6]
wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set *him* [in raising him
from the dead and making him sit][7] at his own right hand in the heavenly *places*,[8]
21 Far [over][9] above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion [lordship],
and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to
22 come: And hath put [And subjected] all *things* under his feet, and gave him *to be*
23 the head over all *things* to the church, Which is his body, the fulness of him that
[who] filleth all[10] in all.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 15.—ℵ.[1] A. B. and some other authorities omit τὴν ἀγάπην; ℵ.[3] adds it. The omission is an evident error of the transcriber. [K. L., nearly all versions, most fathers support the longer reading, which is adopted by Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott and the great majority of editors and commentators. The repetition of τήν readily accounts for the omission, while there is little reason for accepting an insertion from Col. i. 4.—In the above emendations Ellicott has been followed. *For this cause* is adopted in preference to *wherefore* (the rendering for διό) and *on this account* (which is more modern). The more indefinite participial construction, *having heard*, is necessary here; *the faith which is among you* is more exact than *your* faith (see *Exeg. Notes*), while *the love which ye have* brings out the force of the second τήν.—R.]

[2] Ver. 16.—[The *Rec.* reads: μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιούμενος, on the authority of D.[3] E. K. L. (F. G. transposing: ποιούμενος ὑμῶν), most cursives, Vulgate, Syriac versions, Coptic, most fathers; accepted by Tischendorf (but not in all editions), Griesbach, Ellicott, Wordsworth (De Wette and Braune tacitly). In ℵ. A. B. D.,[1] and about 10 cursives, ὑμῶν is omitted; accepted by Rückert, Lachmann, Meyer, Alford. The question is a delicate one: Was the word inserted where the meaning is so obvious, or was it omitted because occurring so immediately before? The variation in position favors the former theory, but a similar omission by nearly the same authorities in 1 Thess. i. 2 is almost decisive for the latter. See *Exeg. Notes* for the interpretation of Meyer and Alford, resulting from the acceptance of the briefer reading.—R.]

[3] Ver. 18.—Instead of καρδίας (ℵ. A. B. D. E. F. G. K. L. and others) a few [*Rec.*, fathers, no uncials] have διανοίας, an evident gloss from iv. 18. [There should be merely a comma after *enlightened* in the English text.—On the reasons for rejecting the absolute construction followed in the E. V., see *Exeg. Notes*.—R.]

[4] Ver. 18.—Καί is omitted in ℵ.[1] A. B. [D.[1] F.; by Lachmann, Rückert, Alford, Braune. It is found in ℵ.[3] D.[3] E. K. L., nearly all cursives retained by Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott, Eadie. The probability is against its genuineness, yet it may have been omitted because καί follows in ver. 10.—R.]—A very few authorities substitute τί for τίς.

[5] Ver. 19.—[On this choice of words, see *Exeg. Notes*.—R.]

[6] Ver. 20.—[Braune apparently accepts the reading ἐνέργησεν, which is sustained by ℵ. D. F. K. L. (So *Rec.*), accepted by Ellicott among other careful critics. The perfect ἐνήργηκεν (A. B.) is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, mainly for the sufficient reason that the more usual aorist would scarcely have been altered to the perfect, while the succeeding aorists might readily occasion the alteration *from* the perfect.—Hence we render: "hath wrought." —R.]

[7] Ver. 20.—ℵ. A. B. and others read: καθίσας [adopted by Rückert, Lachmann, Alford. Tischendorf varies. The *Rec.* reads ἐκάθισεν, with D. F. K. L. and most cursives. So Eadie, Ellicott, and Meyer (apparently); but the change to the finite verb looks more like the attempted relief of the construction.—R.]

[8] Ver. 20.—Instead of ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις in ℵ.[1] and most authorities, ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς [an evident gloss] is found in B. with a few minor authorities.

[9] Ver. 21.—[*Far above* (E. V.) involves more than is expressed by the Greek word ὑπεράνω, according to the most exact commentators.—R.]

[10] Ver. 23.—[The *Rec.* omits τά before πάντα, but on altogether insufficient authority. No important alterations have been made in the rendering of this clause, because it is almost impossible to change the literal rendering of the E. V., without substituting an explanation for the translation: Braune's view would require: all things in all (persons), but the difference of gender he accepts cannot be expressed in an English rendering.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.—After the praise of God on account of His grace towards Christendom, to which the readers of this letter belong (ver. 13) has been expressed (vers. 3–14), there follows on account of this very grace the Apostle's thanksgiving for the readers' faith and love in his prayers (vers. 15, 16), out of which he gives prominence to the *petition*, united with his thanksgiving, that God would make them know the glory of their calling and inheritance as well as of His power (vers. 17–19), which He has shown and will show in the

Redemption through Christ, the Head of the church (vers. 20–23).

It is not proper to find here, as OLSHAUSEN does, after an "effusion of love," only a "thanksgiving for the faith of the readers," as far as ii. 10, without perceiving the profound, rich instruction contained in these verses. But it is not precisely a prayer for the readers which follows, as HARLESS says; he only mentions what he does when thinking of the church. This prayer and supplication to God about and for souls is the apostolic ministry in faith, care and joy; and the *whole Church should know it* and should infer from this petition, how weak and needy she is in and of herself, even though born a heavenly seed for heaven; and how necessary earnest, persevering prayer and supplication on her part always is, for her preservation and prosperity.

[After praise comes prayer (EADIE). ELLICOTT: "I ever give thanks, and pray that you may be enlightened to know the hope of His calling, the riches of His inheritance, and the greatness of His power, which was especially displayed in the Resurrection and supreme exaltation of Christ."—ALFORD, following the Trinitarian division of STIER: "*The idea of the Church* carried forward, in the form of a prayer for the Ephesians, in which the fulfilment of the Father's counsel through the Son and by the Spirit, in His people, is set forth, as consisting in the *knowledge* of the hope of His calling, of the riches of His promise, and the power which He exercises on His saints as first wrought by Him in Christ, whom He has made Head over all to the Church."—R.]

The Apostle's Thanksgiving (vers. 15, 16).

Ver. 15. **For this cause**, *διὰ τοῦτο*, refers to what precedes, and on account of the close connection of the individual parts with each other, to vers. 3-14. So most ancient and modern commentators (ŒCUMENIUS: *διὰ τὰ ἀποκείμενα ἀγαθὰ τοῖς ὀρθῶς πιστεύουσι καὶ βιοῦσι καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐν τοῖς σωθησομένοις τετάχθαι ἡμᾶς*); it is not merely an appendage to vers. 13, 14, because the thanksgiving and petition apply to the *readers* only (MEYER, RUECKERT), nor to the last clause (ver. 14: "to the praise of His glory"), as GROTIUS thinks. But it treats of more than thanksgiving, of petition, supplication, not merely of the readers, but also of all Christendom (*εἰς ἡμᾶς*, ver. 19; comp. vers. 20-23).

[The reference to the whole preceding paragraph is defended by HARLESS (so CHRYSOSTOM, WINZER, SCHENKEL and many others). It accords best with Braune's exegesis of vers. 13, 14, to accept this view, but EADIE, ELLICOTT, HODGE follow THEOPHYLACT, in referring it to vers. 13, 14. ALFORD: "On account of what has gone before, since ver. 3; but especially of what has been said since ver. 13, where *καὶ ὑμεῖς* first came in." The more restricted view seems preferable, but we must then accept an expanded reference in ver. 19.—R.]

I also, *καὶ ἐγώ*.—The unexpressed fellowship in which Paul thus marks himself, as ver. 13 (*καὶ ὑμεῖς*), is to be inferred from the context, from the clause *ἀκούσας—οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν*. He thinks of the Christians, who have spoken of the readers' Christian state with joy and thanksgiving, and "expects, that all Christians, especially they themselves to whom he writes, would do the same" (HARLESS). Hence it is not = *even* I also, a believing Israelite (BAUMGARTEN); such arrogance he would have opposed, not possessed. Nor is it = also I, your Apostle (STIER) [EADIE]; He places himself as a member of the body of Christ, who is the Head, in the Church, not above it. [DE WETTE unwarrantably joins *καί* with the preceding *διὰ τοῦτο*. ALFORD objects to the view of MEYER ("Paul knows that he *cooperates* with the readers in his prayerful activity"), preferring to take *καί* as marking the resumption of the first person after the second. ELLICOTT thus expresses Braune's view: "*Κἀγὼ* is thus faintly corresponsive with *καὶ ὑμεῖς*, and hints at the union in prayer and praise which subsisted between the Apostle and his converts."—R.]

Having heard, *ἀκούσας*.—This marks nothing further than that he had heard, and accordingly indicates only, that what has been heard has been spoken of, hence that the Apostle was not in Ephesus, when he heard. GROTIUS is therefore correct: *loquitur apostolus de profectu evangelii apud Ephesios, ex quo ipse ab illis discesserat.* So THEODORET, HARLESS, MEYER and others. Nothing is said respecting acquaintance or non-acquaintance (against OLSHAUSEN [who thinks the larger part were probably unknown to him—R.]); it is used in the former case, Philem. 5, in the latter, Col. i. 4; Rom. i. 8. BENGEL: *Hoc referri potest non solum ad ignotos facie, sed etiam ad familiarissimos, pro statu eorum præsenti.* It is therefore not = *scire, comperire* (HAMMOND), as though it described personal observation, since it is the very opposite; but at the same time nothing can be inferred from this against the composition of this Epistle for the Ephesians, nor that he wrote the letter before his personal acquaintance, nor yet that he had other churches in his mind at the same time (STIER).*

Of the faith which is among you in the Lord Jesus, *τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ*.—To this Col. i. 4 is parallel: "your faith in Christ Jesus," *etc.* Accordingly *τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν* here seems to be equivalent to *τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν* there [so E. V.]. But "faith among you" differs somewhat from "your faith:" the relation of the faith to the subjects is different: in the first case, in accordance with the notion of the preposition (*κατὰ τὴν πόλιν*, Luke viii. 39, *κατ' οἶκον* not = *ἐν οἴκῳ*, see WINER, p. 374), which is *distributive*, the faith is merely to be found there, within the church, even though each one does not have it, and believers and unbelievers dwell side by side, in the other case, however, the faith is the possession of the individuals; WINER, p. 146, *fides, quæ ad vos pertinet, apud vos (in vobis?) est.*† Such cir-

* [On the other hand, the aorist must not be taken as frequentative, so as to show from such a sense, that he had frequent communication with them as a well-known church. Even EADIE, who at first adopted this view, citing Kühner and Buttmann in support of it, is disposed to defer to the judgment which WINER (p. 260) pronounces against it. HODGE seems to have been led into the same error.—R.]

† [MEYER admits no distinction between the two passages, while EADIE, finding this form singular in the New Testa-

cumlocutions have their special shadings of thought, as τὴν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐπαγγελίαν (Acts xxiii. 21), τῇ ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀγάπῃ (1 Cor. viii. 7), *promissio a te profecta*, *amor qui a vobis proficiscitur*, are not exactly equivalent to *tua promissio*, *amor vester*. Comp. WINER, p. 181. STIER is excellent: A hint that a gracious treasure of faith and love is indeed present within the church, yet not certainly active in every member of it. [So ALFORD.] The notion of the *substantive* is not, however, thereby modified, as though the objective nature of faith were to be understood here, and the individual quality of faith in the particular persons, in Col. i. 4 (HARLESS) [ELLICOTT]; with the Apostle the faith in Ephesus as among the Colossians remains the subject of thanksgiving; and the genitive indicates nothing about individual *quality*, only the possession of the individuals, still less any thing about *purity* or impurity (MATTHIES); nor is any hint given respecting *fides qua* or *fides quæ creditur*.

It is indeed here as there more closely defined as the faith "in the Lord Jesus," as Gal. iii. 26. The preposition marks the foundation of the faith: founded in the Lord Jesus, or its life-sphere, without placing any other aim of the faith. There is no reason for understanding here εἰς θεόν from 1 Pet. i. 21: "who by him do believe in God" (BENGEL: *fidem erga Deum in domino Jesu;* GROTIUS: *fidem in Deum fundatam in Christo*); "in the Lord" is not="through Him," nor ἐν=εἰς (KOPPE, FLATT). The article τὴν is wanting before ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ, because the qualifying phrase adds an integral element to πίστις, which as anticipated is joined *immediately* (Rom. iii. 25; 2 Cor. vii. 7). ["Christ-centred faith" (ELLICOTT).—R.] Comp. WINER, p. 128. The position of the words does not permit our connecting ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ with ὑμᾶς (WINZER); besides πίστις requires further definition more than ὑμᾶς.

And the love which ye have unto all the saints, καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους.—[See *Textual Note* [1].—R.] This sets forth the first and immediate manifestation of the faith. CHRYSOSTOM aptly says: πανταχοῦ συνάπτει καὶ συγκολλᾷ τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην, θαυμαστήν τινα ξυνωρίδα. *Quisquis fidem et amorem habet, particeps est totius benefactionis* (BENGEL). This love is, however, more closely defined as "unto all the saints." On the article [which here specializes love.—R.] see WINER, p. 126. "Paul had here first the idea of love *in itself* and then *added* in his thought τὴν εἰς πάντας" (MEYER). Ἅγιοι are Christians. Hence: "*all saints*" (iii. 8, 18; vi. 18, 24) points to *brotherly love* as *character Christianismi*, John xiii. 34 f.; 1 John v. 1. As little as this notion is to be enlarged here into universal philanthropy, as CALVIN would do, and as is the case in 1 Cor. xiii.; Gal. v. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 1; Tit. iii. 2, also in 2 Pet. i. 7 (ἐν τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τὴν ἀγάπην), so little and still less is brotherly love to be narrowed down, with THEODORET, to *liberality*. At the same time we should not overlook the emphasis resting on the word "all," permitting no distinction as respects condition, rank, possessions or internal endowment, either mental or spiritual.

Ver. 16. **Cease not to give thanks for you**, οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.—Thus or εὐχαριστῶ πάντοτε, 1 Cor. i. 4; Phil. i. 3; Col. i. 3; 1 Thess. i. 2; Phil. 4; comp. WINER, p. 323. Paul never ceases to be a giver of thanks. [The participle points to a state supposed to be already in existence. EADIE: "As one giving thanks for you I cease not." ULPHILUS: *non cessans gratias dico*.—R.] The phrase ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, as in ver. 2: 1 Tim. ii. 1, marks the protection of prayer, like that of a shield *over* the assailed (WINER, p. 359) while περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν (Rom. i. 8) denotes the position of the protector around the protected.

Making mention of you, μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιούμενος, adds a limitation; he thanks constantly whenever he thinks of them; but that happens daily.—**In my prayers**, ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου.—This indicates that Paul has and takes occasion to think of them from his prayers.* Comp. WINER, p. 352; 1 Thess. i. 2; Rom. i. 10. Praying is the Apostle's daily doing, and therewith arises the thought about his church, changing his prayer into intercession. The subject of his thought and petition is not, therefore, precisely the faith and love of the Ephesians (MEYER [ALFORD] who rejects ὑμῶν), but themselves, with their necessities indeed, which determine the purport of the petition.—"No thanksgiving without petition, so long as perfection and completion are not yet there" (STIER).

The Apostle's petition as to its purport. Vers. 17-19.

Ver. 17. **That**, ἵνα, has its parallel in ὅπως, Phil. vi. and must retain, as in iii. 16, the signification of the purpose, design Comp. WINER, pp. 418 f., 428 f. The Apostle's will, in the very thought of his prayer, is directed to this, that God *should* give (MEYER, SCHENKEL). Hence there is no reason for weakening the force of ἵνα here into: that He *may* give (WINER, p. 273), as if it introduced only the object, the purport of the petition (HARLESS, STIER); for although Paul did not regard his request "as *causa* of Divine favors," nor purpose "*thereby*" to bestow upon others the gift of grace, yet still in his petitions offered in the name of Jesus (John xiv. 13; xv. 16; vi. 23) he has the design as well as the hope, that they should take place.† BENGEL: *Argumentum precum pro veris Christianis.*

---

ment (though frequently used for the possessive genitive in later classical Greek), makes it denote more characteristic possession, differing thus from nearly all the commentators. —R.]

* ["In ἐπί with a genitive, the apparent *temporal* reference partakes somewhat of the *local* reference of juxtaposition," BERNHARDY. So ALFORD, ELLICOTT, and now EADIE who formerly omitted the *sub-local* reference. The preposition "serves to express the concurrent circumstances and relations, in which and under which an event took place."—R.]

† [On the force of ἵνα comp. TITTMANN, *Syn.* N. T., II., p. 35, ff., who is perhaps the ablest defender of the frequency of its ecbatic signification. But many of the instances he cites are very doubtful. The eventual or ecbatic sense (indicative of result) is not defensible here. The very best explanation of the force of ἵνα after verbs of praying, *etc.*, is given by ALFORD (on 1 Cor. xiv. 3): "The idea of *purpose* is inseparably bound up in this particle, and can be traced wherever it is used. At the same time, prayer being a *direct seeking* of the fulfilment of the purpose on account of which we pray—not like many other actions, *indirectly* connected with it,—the *purport* and *purpose* become *compounded in the expression.*" This *sub-final* force is accepted by ELLICOTT, denied by EADIE and by MEYER, who rejects everything short of the strict final

The God of our Lord Jesus Christ, *ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*—Here we must hold (see ver. 3 f.), that he is speaking of the Incarnate One, the God-*man*, to whom God is God, worshipped by Him also (STIER). It does not suffice to say, that the meaning is, God sent Him, He bore witness of God and returned to God (HARLESS) [apparently HODGE also].

The Father of glory, *ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης.* This parallel clause is far more difficult than the last. First of all, *πατήρ*, corresponding to *θεός*, is to be retained in its established meaning, "Father," hence not to be taken in the sense of *causa* (GROTIUS), *auctor* (*ὁ μεγάλα ὑμῖν δεδωκὼς ἀγαθά*, CHRYSOSTOM and others), source, origin (MATTHIES, SCHENKEL). The genitive, *τῆς δόξης*, designates the possession, the character of the Father, to whom the glory belongs, which is = כָּבוֹד, the Divine glory and majesty; it is like "the God of glory" (Acts vii. 2; Ps. xxix. 3), "the Lord of glory" (1 Cor. ii. 8), "the King of glory" (Ps. xxiv. 7); comp. also "the Father of mercies" (2 Cor. i. 3). Hence: the Father full of glory. As parallel to the genitive: "of our Lord Jesus Christ," we must also in connection with "glory," think of Him, in whom it was manifested. BENGEL: *Pater gloriæ, infinitæ illius, quæ refulget in facie Christi; imo gloriæ, quæ est ipse filius Dei, unde etiam nobis hereditas gloriosa obtinget* (ver. 18). HARLESS: Father of glory, because the glory presses upon the Apostle, which God has revealed to men in His Son.

Though *the Greek Fathers* go too far (*δόξαν γὰρ τὴν θείαν φύσιν ὠνόμασεν*), yet "the Father full of glory," following "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ," is evidently not without a reference to Christ and of such a kind, that the Apostle's first phrase conceives rather of the God-*man*;* the second of the *God*-man. This explanation accordingly is not a curiosity (RUECKERT), needing no contradiction (OLSHAUSEN), nor is it *obscurius et remotius* (A-LAPIDE). It is much more of a curiosity, to wish to connect thus: *Deus qui est domini nostri Jesu Christi pater, gloriæ;* since then *ὁ θεός* and *τῆς δόξης* must be taken together, while *τοῦ κυρίου—ὁ πατήρ* is inserted between them (VATABLE). The conjecture of PISCATOR, that *πατήρ* and *θεός* were first written in interchanged positions, is very bold. Still it cannot be said that our phrase is = *pater gloriosus* (CALVIN and others), or *cui debetur honor, venerandus*, or *præstantissimus* (WAHL and others), or the Almighty Father (KOPPE).—ŒCUMENIUS aptly remarks: *πρὸς τὸ προσκείμενον ὀνομάζει θεόν.* The designation of God in this passage corresponds entirely with the fervor and confidence of the Apostle's petition respecting the affairs of the kingdom of Christ.

May give unto you, *δώη ὑμῖν.*—*Δώη* the optative; John xv. 16: *δώῃ* the conjunctive; the Ionic conjunctive form is not sufficiently attested in the New Testament, and *δῷ* is preferred [in that passage, B. giving it here also.—R.] The optative as *modus optandi* is here, especially in *oratio obliqua* (MATTHIES), used in the place of the conjunctive (WINER, p. 273). In 2 Tim. i. 16, 18 we find a similar usage. [MEYER and ELLICOTT regard the optative as chosen to follow the present here, because the answer belongs to what is hoped for, *etc.*, the latter finding in its use a support for his view of the sub-final force of *ἵνα*. But the view of ALFORD (and EADIE) is preferable: The optative "is used when the purpose is not that of the writer as *he is writing*, but is described as that of himself or some one else *at another time*," thus falling in effect under the rule of the *oratio obliqua*.—R.]

The spirit of wisdom and revelation, *πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως*, is the object of the preceding verb. The omission of the article before the genitives points to the close connection with the governing substantive, to which also the article may be wanting, without its becoming indefinite, as the genitives contain the closer definition; Luke xxiii. 46: *εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου* (WINER, p. 118 f.). God gives as a Father to His children, who have become such through Christ, of His Spirit; hence the reference may well be to the Holy Ghost; but since they have already been sealed with this (ver. 13), this efficient, personal, power recedes rather, and we are to understand the spirit wrought or to be wrought by the same in Christians. So Gal. vi. 1; 2 Tim. i. 7. So OLSHAUSEN, STIER: Something of God, yet manifesting itself as in man. Hence we are not to understand the human spirit of itself, or the human heart (RUECKERT: God give you a wise heart, open to His revelation), nor yet precisely the Person of the Holy Ghost (BENGEL: *idem Spiritus, qui est promissionis, in progressu fidelium est etiam sapientiæ et revelationis; sapientia in nobis operatur sapientiam,* REVELATIO *cognitionem;* MATTHIES, MEYER).* Evidently Paul is speaking of a gift for all Christians; hence *Charisms* are not meant, as 1 Cor. xii. 8; xiv. 12; vi. 26 (OLSHAUSEN).

Both "wisdom" and "revelation" point to universal gifts to Christians, and to what is or comes to pass in them, hence to something subjective. By "wisdom" we understand a continued condition, by "revelation" the single glances afforded us, into the truths of Christianity, into the will of God in special circumstances and situations of life, into the human heart, into the course of time, into eternal life. The former includes the *φρόνησις*, "understanding," joined with it in ver. 8; the latter is "the very necessary private revelation for every Christian" (STIER), as 1 Cor. ii. 10. Paul adds the special to the general in the same way (Rom. i. 5; v. 15; xi. 29). Accordingly we are not to consider the second an objective medium for the first (HARLESS); in that case, the position would be reversed (MEYER).† Comp. Col. i. 9.

---

sense. The ecbatic sense is rare, it must be admitted, and due to "Hebrew teleology," which reverently accepted a prophecy as fulfilled.—R.]

* [It is perhaps unwise to press any Christological reference upon this phrase upon the ground of its parallelism with the preceding one, though this is preferable to the many distorted views, which have been adopted through fear of an Arian interpretation.—R.]

* [EADIE and HODGE defend the formal reference to the Holy Spirit here, but it seems better with ALFORD and BRAUNE to accept *πνεῦμα* as "the complex idea, of the spirit of man indwelt by the Spirit of God, so that as such, it is His special gift." This intermediate or complex sense is that suggested in my Excursus, *Romans*, p. 235, B., but too often overlooked.—R.]

† [These genitives are also characterizing genitives, it would seem. EADIE takes the latter as indicating the mode by which

In the full knowledge of him [ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ].—First the meaning of the words. In ἐπίγνωσις the preposition, which "renders prominent the *intension* of the verbal notion to its object" (HARLESS), must not be overlooked, and the distinction from γνῶσις must be maintained. It is *major exactiorque cognitio* (GROTIUS,) *plena et accurata cognitio* (WAHL). 1 Cor. xiii. 12 is instructive: "Now I know (γιγνώσκω) in part; but then shall I know (ἐπιγνώσομαι) even as also I am known" (ἐπεγνώσθην).* Hence it is not = *agnitio* (CALOVIUS and others), nor can it be of any force here, that γνῶσις designates the higher, the charismatic form of knowledge, 1 Cor. xii. 8; xiii. 8 (OLSHAUSEN), since this technical term designates the character, not the *degree* (MEYER). The context, vers. 18, 19, evidently determines that the knowledge of God is here referred to, and does not permit αὐτοῦ to be referred to Christ (BEZA, ERASMUS, LUTHER and others); nor can it remain undetermined (CALVIN). Finally ἐν, "in," designates the sphere within which that is accomplished, which has been spoken of: it cannot possibly be taken as = εἰς (*Vulgate*, LUTHER and others), or = *per* (ERASMUS and others), or = *una cum* (FLATT). [HODGE most unwarrantably renders the preposition ἐν, "together with."—R.]

The *connection* with the verb "give" is clear then: The knowledge of God is a status or circle of life, wrought already by the Spirit and word of God, in which he should and must be, who will and shall receive the spirit of wisdom and revelation, since this does not take place without means, Col. i. 9, 10. Advance is made from truth to truth, from knowledge to knowledge. The connection with what follows: πεφωτισμένους ὀφθαλμούς (CHRYSOSTOM and others), is impossible, both grammatically and logically, on account of the appended εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς, which is joined at the close of ver. 18, just as ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ here in ver. 17; the two phrases correspond to each other. But the connection with ὑμῖν is quite as impossible, as with ἀποκαλύψεως (a suggestion of KOPPE'S); it is contrary to the *usus loquendi* and introduces erroneous thoughts: for it is not to those, who have known, who are real worshippers, that He gives such a spirit, as He does not give the spirit through knowledge, but rather knowledge *through* the Spirit, nor does revelation consist only in the knowledge of God, although this is the beginning, centre and main point to which all comes and returns. [EADIE follows KOPPE, the result being a confusion respecting these phrases, which is very uncommon with him.—R.]

Ver. 18. **Having the eyes of your heart enlightened** [πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν].—This is added without a conjunction, seeming to be in apposition, with the emphasis on the participle; the *being enlightened* is, what God should give. Τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, eyes, He need not first give; BENGEL: *articulus præsupponit oculos jam præsentes.* But the Apostle wishes that the eyes may be given in a new quality (HARLESS). Accordingly we should not render: enlightened eyes (LUTHER); in that case we should find, τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοὺς πεφωτισμένους. It is arbitrary to correct the reading into πεφωτισμένοις (PISCATOR and others), as though it belonged to ὑμῖν. It is untenable to accept an accusative absolute (BEZA, KOPPE, MEYER [E. V., EADIE), and to refer the participle to ὑμῖν, so that the accusative of the noun is made to contain the closer definition; for then the recipients would have been, which is contrary to Scripture and to fact, enlightened before they received the Spirit of wisdom and revelation; the reference to the *effect:* so that you are illuminated as respects your eyes—is grammatically impossible. Nor should εἶναι be interpolated (FLATT).

[The interpretation: so that you are illuminated as respects your eyes, is that of MEYER, who does not defend the accusative absolute. ELLICOTT and ALFORD, whose rendering is given in the English text, refer the participle to ὑμῖν, as a lax construction, taking the noun as an accusative of limiting reference. Notwithstanding Dr. Braune's objection, this seems the best solution. The clause "serves to define the result of the gift of the Spirit, and owing to the subsequent infinitive, which expresses the *purpose* of the illumination, not unnaturally lapses into the accusative" (ELLICOTT). See ALFORD for similar constructions. The accusative absolute which also expresses a result, is a very doubtful construction, see MEYER *in loco*, and on Rom. viii. 3. The appositional construction, which makes our clause the object of δώῃ, is open to fewer grammatical than logical objections. The enlightenment as regards the eyes of the heart ought not to be put as correlative or co-ordinate with the gift of the Spirit of wisdom, *etc.* This objection holds, however, the meaning of our clause may be enlarged, as is done below, and by HARLESS and others. Braune's view, it should be added, is supported by RUECKERT, MATTHIES, MEIER, HOLZHAUSEN, HARLESS, OLSHAUSEN, DE WETTE and others; apparently by HODGE, who does not notice the construction preferred in this note.—R.]

The value of the gift is well described by GREGORY NAZIAN.: εἰ γὰρ σκότος ἡ ἄγνοια καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία, φῶς ἂν εἴη ἡ γνῶσις καὶ ὁ βίος ἔνθεος. According to v. 8, compared with iv. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Heb. vi. 4, the light of life is meant, that illumination which is already connected with sanctification and rooted in experience (HARLESS, STIER), so that it cannot be referred to merely intellectual insight (RUECKERT and others). [Yet "*the eyes* of the heart" are spoken of, giving prominence to the perceptive side.—R.]

The eyes are τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν, "of your heart," and this is the centre of life (HARLESS), the core of the personality (OLSHAUSEN), and not merely mind or soul, without disposition. Matth. xxiii. 15: τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσι. Comp. iv. 22; Rom. i. 21; 2 Cor. iv. 6. *Cor est, quo tan-*

---

the wisdom is imparted, which appears illogical. Dr. HODGE does not clearly indicate what view he adopts, but apparently inclines toward that accepted above.—R.]

* [The use of the verb in this passage, applying it in the second instance to God, contradicts the position taken by EADIE, that ἐπί has in our word an *additive* force, referring to the successive increments of knowledge, for in that case it could not be applied to God, as indeed he affirms ἐπίγνωσις never is.—R.]

tas res percipimus (BENGEL).* It is thus marked by this qualifying phrase, that we, in spite of our old nature, are renewed and made susceptible of that wisdom and revelation, that is the light for which the eyes of our heart are prepared; our heart should become secure and full of the Spirit. Thus this apposition is defended from MEYER's objections.

That ye may know, *εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς*.—This sets forth the aim of the enlightening, toward which progress is made "in the knowledge of Him;" the latter is to be developed. Thus to the ground and outgoing there corresponds the aim, in which the beginning now appears in its extent; the deeper *insight* after the hearing of the proclamation, after the first faith and knowledge and understanding, is here treated of.†

What is the hope of his calling, *τίς ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ*.—The *first* object of this insight is "the hope of His calling." "His," *αὐτοῦ*, according to the context, is to be understood of God; Rom. xi. 29: the "calling of God." He calls; this call is not without effect; and this is the hope, the cause of which is the call. The re-echo in us of this call of God on us is hope, hoping; the Christian's hope lies, not in the eternal "election," but in the temporal "calling." So "joy of the Holy Ghost" (1 Thess. i. 6), "trial of affliction" (2 Cor. viii. 2). Hope is the Christian's advantage (ii. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 13; Rom. v. 2), and a hope that "maketh not ashamed" (Rom. v. 5; viii. 24). To know the character of such hope is not a small matter (against STIER). *Τίς* points then to the character, the quality of this hope. PASSOW *sub voce*. It is therefore not = *πόση, ποταπή*, *quanta* (STIER, OLSHAUSEN, SCHENKEL), but *qualis*, *cujusnam naturæ* (HARLESS, MEYER and others). Nor is *ἐλπίς* = *res sperata* (OLSHAUSEN, STIER [EADIE] and many others), although it can mean this (Col. i. 5: "laid up;" Heb. vi. 18: "set before us;" Gal. v. 5: "wait for the hope of righteousness"), which MEYER [with ELLICOTT] denies. It is inconceivable that *κλῆσις* should be = those called (SCHUETZE). LUTHER renders: "your calling," putting the effect for the cause: "his calling." [With ALFORD, EADIE, and ELLICOTT it is better to take *τίς* in the simple meaning "what," *quæ* (*Vulgate*), without referring either to quality or quantity. As regards "hope," the objective sense must be admitted in the N. T., but the bald *res sperata* does not express the signification here. ALFORD thinks the controversy mere trifling: "If I know *what* the hope is, I know both its essence and its accidents." Even ELLICOTT admits an objective aspect: "the grounds, the state of the hope." HODGE supports the subjective sense. On *κλῆσις*, see *Romans*, pp. 280, 281.—R.]

What the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints [*τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις*].—The *second* object of the insight is the object of the Christian hope, the inheritance, to which "the calling of God" helps us, hence "His:" He gives it, it is from His own. As Divine, eternal life, participation in the kingdom of God, heirship with Christ (God Himself is our portion), it has a "glory" and this glory has "riches," so that it is an important object for our more profound observation. So Col. i. 27: "the riches of the glory of this mystery." It is a weakening of the ideas, to resolve these substantives into objectives: what is the riches of the glorious inheritance (LUTHER), or: what is the glorious riches of His inheritance (STIER). [As MEYER well says: "What a rich, sublime cumulation, setting forth in like terms the weightiness of the matters described;—and not to be *diluted* by any resolving of the genitives into adjectives."—R.]

"In the saints" is added after "His inheritance," without the article (*τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἁγιόις*), and hence conceived of as most closely connected with his inheritance, which is to be found *in* (LUTHER: *an*) and *among* the saints, the called Christians not outside of them. So Rom. ix. 3: "my kinsmen according to the flesh;" 2 Cor. vii. 7: *τὸν ὑμῶν ζῆλον ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ*. Comp. Col. i. 12 (*εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν φωτί*); Acts xx. 32 (*δοῦναι τὴν κληρονομίαν ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πᾶσιν*); xxvi. 18. The Apostle does not say "in you," "us," but states it altogether objectively in humility and wisdom. He speaks indeed of the inheritance of God in Christians, but not of the glory of the portion, nor its riches in the saints, so that we must understand here chiefly the children of God, who are partakers of the inheritance (vers. 11, 14), even though only in its incipient stages; "the riches of the glory" become indeed perceptible even here, but unfold themselves fully only in eternity, which is the more to be included, since here and hereafter are less divided than light and darkness. Accordingly we are not to consider the object of the inheritance to be principally and solely the present kingdom of God on earth (HARLESS), or on the other hand the future kingdom of God to be established at the second Advent (MEYER); nor is the connection of *ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις* with an *ἐστιν* to be supplied (KOPPE and others) possible, since not *ὁ πλοῦτος*, but only *κληρονομία*, is in, on and among the saints.* To join *αὐτοῦ* with

* [ELLICOTT says of the phrase, "the eyes of your heart:" "A somewhat unusual and figurative expression, denoting the inward intelligence of that portion of our immaterial nature (the *ψυχή*) of which the *καρδία* is the imaginary seat." Comp. MEYER, ALFORD, HARLESS and STIER.—R.]

† [Dr. HODGE divides the prayer of the Apostle into three leading petitions: 1. For adequate knowledge of Divine truth; 2. For due appreciation of the future blessedness of the saints; 3. For a proper understanding of what they themselves had already experienced in their conversion. This is well enough for homiletical purposes, but it is very unsatisfactory as an exegesis of the passage, since it places as co-ordinate three clauses, which hold very different relations to each other, destroying altogether the proper final force of *εἰς*, besides being open to other objections. ALFORD rightly takes *εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι* as setting forth the purpose of the *πεφωτισμένους*, not of the *πνεῦμα σοφίας*. What is now described is *involved in* the latter, not its *object*, but that of the former.—R.]

* [This interpretation should not be lightly passed over, since it is sustained by WINER (in earlier editions, not in 6th and 7th), DE WETTE, MEYER and ELLICOTT. The reason for adopting it is the assumption that the article should precede our phrase, were it joined directly with *κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ*, since that expression is so complete in itself as to admit of no qualification forming one conception with it (which is the condition of the omission of the article). Our phrase would then, according to ELLICOTT, define the sphere in which the riches, *etc.*, are peculiarly found, felt and realized. To this view, however, there are grave objections It is awkward to begin with; it disturbs the grammatical parallelism of the clauses, and logically it represents Paul as praying that they might know what great things are already among Christians

ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις (STIER) is inadmissible, because far-fetched. The reference is not to the totality of morally good beings in the other world (RUECKERT), or in the holiest of all (CALOVIUS), as Heb. ix. 12; nor should prominence be given to the thought, as inhering in the text: God inherits the saints (MEYER, ŒTTINGER, STIER), although they belong to Him, and He to them. This is the carrying out, extension and expansion of the thought, but not an exegesis of the words set before us.

Ver. 19. **And what the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe** [*καὶ τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας*].—The *third* object of the insight is *the power of God*, which leads from the calling to the inheritance. The "exceeding greatness" of this power is a worthy object of profound insight (2 Cor. iv. 7: *ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως*); it must and can also be experienced, since it makes itself felt "to us-ward," to those "who believe" in the present, hence, without limiting the circle of those who believe, or passing beyond it, not to all in general, but only to those who admit and consent to this condition appointed by God. Since the preposition designates the direction towards the believers, and the present participle the present time, and the article before the participle marks that word as the ground, condition of the activity (ver. 13; 1 John iii. 23), and since only experiences of the power of God are spoken of, from which "the exceeding greatness" is to be inferred, we must here hold fast to the proofs in this earthly life (CHRYSOSTOM or to HARLESS, STIER), and not apply it to the future (MEYER, SCHENKEL, who however adds, that the beginning of the consummation manifests itself in this life).*

According to the working of the might of his strength,† *κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ*.—In this collocation of words the proper subject is *ἰσχύς*, as *δύναμις* just before, giving prominence to a characteristic, the *strength* (*ἰσχύς* from *ἴς* = seat of elasticity, sinew, muscle, nape of the neck, stem of a tree, hence *vis*); *δύναμις* is *brachium divinum*, *ἰσχύς* its muscles; *κράτος* is the power manifesting itself, the *ἐξουσία*, which rules (*κρατεῖ*); *ἐνέργεια* (*ἐν ἔργῳ*), *efficacia* (ERASMUS), the actual efficiency (HARLESS). So BENGEL, CALVIN: *robur est quasi radix, potentia autem arbor, efficacia fructus.* There is no chance throwing together of words, but an order corresponding to the thought: regard is to be paid chiefly to the efficacy, the effects, in which the power of God's strength allows itself to be perceived and felt. [The language is intended to exalt our ideas of God's power in connection with this "eminent act of His omnipotency."—R.]

Κατά with the accusative is *juxta*, *secundum*, according to, thus designating the norm and standard as well as the motive and occasion (WINER, p. 375 f.). Comp. iv. 7; i. 5, and *κατὰ νόμον* (Luke ii. 22), *κατὰ χάριν* (Rom. iv. 4). The two notions, "according to" and "by virtue of" are related (1 Cor. xii. 8, 9). The simplest connection and that most readily understood by the hearer, is that with "us who believe." We believe only by virtue of the efficacy of the power of God in Christ and upon our souls. [The meaning of the preposition is something less than *propter* and something more than *according* to. On the connection see below.—R.]

So CHRYSOSTOM, who truly and beautifully says: *τοῦ ἀναστῆσαι νεκρὸν πολλῷ θαυμασιώτερον τὸ πεῖσαι ψυχάς.* Just on this account, because we believe only by virtue of the efficacy of God's power, which has enough obstacles to faith to overcome in us, we can understand, how great the power of God is. Since believing is not a momentary affair, but a *status*, preserved by the same power, which produced it, the aorist participle *πιστεύσαντες* is not necessary (BLEEK), and no room is given for the monstrous thought, that faith according to the power of God is spoken of. It is inadmissible to connect, either with the verb *ἐστι* which is understood, or with "the exceeding greatness" (SCHENKEL), or with all the points introduced by "what" (HARLESS), or with "may know" (MEYER). [Dr. HODGE also defends the connection of this clause with *πιστεύοντας*, but it is doubtful whether this is correct. For though undoubtedly expressing a truth, yet it places the rest of the chapter in grammatical dependence on an incidental idea. It has also a suspicion of polemical purpose (against Pelagianism) attached to it, besides pressing too strongly on *κατά* the sense of "in virtue of." It is better then with DE WETTE, EADIE, ELLICOTT, ALFORD and others, to accept a reference which Braune does not mention, *viz.*: to the whole preceding clause: "not however as an explanation (Chrys.) or an amplification (Calv.) of this power, but in accordance with the full ethical force of *κατά*, as a definition of its mode of operation (Eadie), a mighty *measure*, a stupendous *exemplar* by which its infinite powers towards the believing, in its future, yea, and its present manifestations, might be felt, acknowledged, estimated and realized" (ELLICOTT).—R.]

This last objection MEYER, who on all possible occasions adopts a reference to the future kingdom of God at the second Advent, avoids by saying that Paul conceives of it as present (*vergegenwärtiges*). Nor does the absence of the article interfere with the other interpretation. Comp. HARLESS and ALFORD for a clear statement of the case. We give the paraphrase of the latter: "*His inheritance in*, whose example and fulness, and embodying is in *the saints.*" EADIE and HODGE apparently restrict "inheritance" to the future blessing, the former expanding this idea with his usual felicity as a practical expositor.—R.]

* [ELLICOTT agrees with SCHENKEL in taking the primary reference to be to the future, but admits a secondary present reference, which MEYER denies. See the beautiful climax ELLICOTT gives in his note. But the other view is preferable, on the grammatical grounds urged by Braune, and because of the comparison with the *resurrection* of Christ. See HODGE, who quotes CALVIN'S remarks against the notion that this language would be frigid hyperbole if applied to our experience in this life. Dr. HODGE, however, incorrectly takes our clause as a third petition. ELLICOTT and MEYER again supply *ἐστί*, with which they connect *εἰς ἡμᾶς*. It is better, with most, to join it with *δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ*.—ALFORD retains "to us-ward" as better indicating the prominence which belongs to "us" in the fact of its *direction*. "But it is not the power which works faith in us, except in so far indeed as faith is a portion of its whole work: here the *πιστεύοντες* are the material on which the power works."—R.]

† [ALFORD and ELLICOTT prefer "strength of his might;" the former says: "The latter (*ἰσχύς*) is the attribute subjectively considered; the former (*κρώτος*) the weight of that attribute, objectively esteemed." Most commentators accept this distinction; the question is only, whether the inherent strength (*ἰσχύς*) is best expressed in English by the word *strength* or *might.* The former seems preferable.—R.]

The Apostle's petition as to its ground. Vers. 20-23.

Ver. 20. **Which he hath wrought in Christ**—Ἣν ἐνέργησεν,* analogous to ἀγάπην ἀγαπᾶν, ii. 4, is to be referred to ἐνέργειαν. WINER, p. 210 [The cognate accusative]. Nor is ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, without a reference to εἰς ἡμᾶς, ver. 19: in Christ is accomplished that efficacy of God, which is powerful toward us. ["In Him" as our spiritual Head (ELLICOTT and others).—R.]

In raising him from the dead, ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, marks a fact of his working. [The aorist indicates that the act is contemporaneous with that of the preceding verb. ALFORD justly warns against the danger of regarding, "with the shallower expositors, Christ's resurrection as merely a *pledge* of our *bodily* resurrection, or as a mere *figure representing* our *spiritual* resurrection,—not as *involving* the resurrection of the church in both senses." Both HODGE and EADIE fall somewhat short of the full conception thus expressed.—R.]

And making him sit at his own right hand in the heavenly places [καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις].—Thus the exaltation, beginning with the resurrection, was completed (1 Pet. iii. 21 ff.). Instead of the better supported participle, ἐκάθισεν has been generally substituted, because the Greeks disliked the spinning out of long relative and participial sentences, and easily passed over into the finite verb (WINER, p. 533, b.).† Ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ denotes the participation in dominion, the σύνθρονος of the Father (Mark xvi. 19; Rom. viii. 34; Acts vii. 55; Phil. iii. 20 f.; Matth. xx. 21; Mark x. 37). Comp. also 1 Sam. x. 25; 1 Kings ii. 19, in the earthly relations, which are transferred to Christ, Ps. cx. 1. The phrase ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (see on ver. 3), which is the antithesis of ἐκ νεκρῶν, designates space, or as HOFMANN (*Schriftbeweis*, II. 1, p. 334) intimates, the relation to the world; ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ distinguishes Him from spirits, ἐν ἐπουρανίοις locates Him and them alike. We may with as little right understand here the *status cœlestis* (HARLESS and others) as the central place of Divine glory and revelation, the highest, inmost heaven (STIER, SCHENKEL), since the word is used of Satan also (vi. 11, 12).

[The various *local* expressions used in the context seem decisive as to the meaning of ἐπουρανίοις. It refers to heavenly places, is more indefinite than ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, but was chosen here probably on account of the details in ver. 21 (ELLICOTT).—ALFORD reminds us, that "the fact of the universal idea of God's dwelling being in heaven, being only a symbolism common to all men, must not for a moment induce us to let go the verity of Christ's bodily existence, or to explain away the glories of His resurrection into mere spiritualities. As Stephen saw Him, so He veritably is: in human form, locally existent, over above," *etc.*—R.]

Ver. 21. **Over above all principality, and power, and might, and lordship, and every name that is named** [ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου].—The word ὑπεράνω (iv. 10: πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν; Heb. ix. 5), the opposite of ὑποκάτω (κλίνης, Luke viii. 16; τῆς συκῆς, Jno. i. 51; τῶν ποδῶν, Mark vi. 11; Matth. xxii. 44; Rev. xii. 1), can only mean "over, above" [so ELLICOTT, ALFORD] without marking any particular eminence, GREEK FATHERS, BEZA, ESTIUS [EADIE] or dominion (BENGEL), although the latter inheres in the nature of the case (MEYER). It is to be connected with "setting," and with its genitives ("all principality," *etc.*) forms the detailed description and explanation of the phrase, "at his right hand in the heavenly places;" the two belong together, the first being more closely defined by the second.

Of these four names the first three occur in the same order in 1 Cor. xv. 24, the first two occur in our Epistle, iii. 10, and in Col. i. 16, after εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες, joined with εἴτε also and in the same order, in 1 Pet. iii. 22: ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων. On the other hand in Rom. viii. 38: ἄγγελοι and ἀρχαί, like ζωή and θάνατος, δύναμις, ὕψωμα and βάθος, are contrasted with each other by οὔτε—οὔτε; so that we can infer nothing thence respecting our passage.* A certain consistency is noticeable in the use of these words. Besides the reference to angels is quite obvious, being required here by the context, especially ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. CALVIN. *Cur non simpliciter nominavit angelos? Respondeo, amplificandæ Christi gloriæ causa Paulum exaggerasse hos titulos, ac si diceret; nihil est tam sublime aut excelsum, quocunque nomine censeatur, quod non subjectum sit Christi majestati.* According to HOFMANN (*Schriftbeweis*, I. p. 34)† we cannot understand here a *climax descendens* (MEYER, STIER). These designations for the world of angels were given through the higher position of the angels as the messengers of God (Ps. ciii. 20 f.; Heb. i. 6 f., 13 f.), as holy (Ps. lxxxix. 5; Dan. viii. 13). Since the context points to the resurrection of Christ, the Crucified, and His exaltation to a participation in the government of the world, as a fact, in which we see the efficiency of God, according to which He works on us also, in order to make us His children and heirs of His glory, we may well apply these terms to good as well as bad angels, aye, we can scarcely limit the reference to the angels, who reach also into this world, the αἰὼν οὗτος, especially as both πάσης and the concluding phrase "every name that is named," which corresponds entirely with "nor any other creature" (Rom. viii. 38), warrant an unbounded

* [See *Textual Note* 6, where the reading ἐνήργηκεν is accepted. MEYER notes its distinctive sense here in referring to an act completed, as viewed by the writer.—R.]

† [ELLICOTT, adopting the reading ἐκαθίσεν, says the change to the finite verb, is especially designed to enhance the importance of the truth conveyed by the participle, referring to the same page in WINER. The main thought at first is that of the resurrection, but the Apostle is speedily absorbed with the other, which accords so well with the ground-tone of the Epistle.—R.]

* [The variation in the text of Rom. viii. 38 indicates certainly that the early transcribers referred δυνάμεις to angels, since there is no other motive for the change in its position; the correct reading however seems to justify a reference to earthly powers, so that as remarked above we gain nothing decisive from that passage.—R.]

† [HOFMANN denies any reference to gradations in rank, admitting only a designation of various relations to God and the world, but this distinction does not seem to be tenable.—R.]

extension, limited only to power and might. HARLESS only concedes this, preferring however the reference to *good angels* alone, as does MEYER, who then refers "name" to every thing created. In such universality is the passage understood by ERASMUS, RUECKERT, STIER [ALFORD] and others. With STIER we must understand under the first four designations, personalities, not merely principles, forces, factors, recognizing them in "every name that is named," the transition to the impersonal (*τὰ πάντα*). Accordingly the following views are to be rejected: the reference to devils alone (SCHOLZ), to Jewish hierarchs (SCHÖTTGEN), to heathen (VAN TILL) human potentates (MORUS); the affirmation of a polemical purpose, not at all indicated, against angel-worship (BUCER, ESTIUS, HUG), or a preservative purpose against possible infection through false *gnosis* (OLSHAUSEN [HODGE, though not decidedly]); also every attempt to define the different grades of these groups of angels, and the explanation of "name" as a summing up of a *nomen dignitatis potentiæve* (ERASMUS and others); it is not even to be limited to names of "such a character" (HARLESS).

[It is on some accounts safest to take the four terms here introduced in the widest, most indefinite sense. Still it would seem best, if any limitation is made to refer the words to *good angels* alone, including of course under that term all created heavenly intelligences. The prevailing reference in these words is to angelic powers, to good (Eph. iii. 10; Col. i. 16; ii. 10) and bad (vi. 12; Col. ii. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 24; comp. Rom. viii. 38) alike. The preceding local definition would not exclude the latter, as Christ is placed "over above" all these (besides *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις* is apparently applicable to bad angels also, vi. 12). But the "verse relates to Christ's exaltation in heaven rather than His victory over the powers of hell." Then without attempting any closer definition of these *classes*, we may still admit a *descensive* order throughout: First the Exalted One, then the various gradations of heavenly Intelligence, then "every name that is named," a view which is favored by the apparent regularity in the order (comp. Col. i. 16). "Every name that is named" includes more than persons, in this view, more than titles of honor: Every thing which can bear a name. No less comprehensive sense seems admissible.—ALFORD accepts the most universal reference for the four terms under discussion, but adopts rather too abstract a sense.—ELLICOTT refers to the list of authors in HAGENBACH, *History of Doctrine*, § 131. —R.]

Not only in this world, but also in that which is to come [*οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι*].—This qualifies "named," establishing the pre-eminence of Christ above all that is ever named in both this world and that to come. BEZA: *præstantiam non esse temporariam, sed æternam.* We find a parallel in "things present," "things to come" (Rom. viii. 38). Yet the expression here is not purely=now and hereafter [HODGE], but designates the present time as the first age, disappearing in the transition to the future glory, the future as the eternal glory beginning with the return of Christ. Paul takes the reference to time from the system of the world ruling in each period, thinking at once of pre-messianic and post-messianic, terrestrial and celestial worlds. Excellent, but rather abrupt is BENGEL's remark: *αἰών denotat hic non tempus, sed systema rerum et operum suo tempore revelatum et permanens.* It is then=*always* (HARLESS) with respect to this institution of the history of salvation (STIER).* Comp. my remarks on *αἰὼν οὗτος* and *μέλλων*, *Biblework*, 1 John ii. 18, p. 73 f. The connection with *καθίσας* (CALVIN and others) is incorrect and also the remark of BENGEL, following CHRYSOSTOM: "*Imperia, potestas, etc., sunt in futuro, sed tamen* NOMINANTUR *etiam in seculo hoc; at ea quoque, quæ in præsenti ne nominantur quidem, sed in futuro demum nobis nomine et re patefient, Christo subjecta sunt.*"

Ver. 22. **And subjected all things under his feet** [*καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ*].—Even if we retain the participle in ver. 20, we must here accept the transition from the participle to the finite verb. The words themselves are not difficult. Evidently, and in this the advance of thought consists, *πάντα*, "all things," is to be applied to all that is created, and *ὑπέταξεν*, "subjected," with its closer definition, refers of itself as well as on account of Ps. viii. 6 (comp. iii. 6) to conflict and opposition, which was suggested already by the passage (Ps. cx. 1) evidently in mind in ver. 20: "set him at his own right hand." The Lord Himself had quoted Ps. viii. 3. The same Psalm (ver. 6) is used with special emphasis in 1 Cor. xv. 27; Heb. ii. 6–8. Should the Psalm refer to the glory of the first Adam (Gen. i. 26-28) and its restoration, as is definitely indicated in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 6-8), then we must suppose here, that Paul is led by such thoughts to the use of this passage, especially as the context requires it, treating as it does of what shall occur to us, in accordance with what has occurred to Christ. *Dominium nunc illi uni (Christo) tribui potest, quandoquidem per Adamum primum potestatem dignitatemque a Deo concessam nostrum genus amisit* (PETER MARTYR). There is therefore no tautological repetition here, but from above descensively the Apostle marks, after a sketch of the *dignity* of Christ (SCHENKEL), the *sovereignty*, which subjects all things, even the unconscious creation (OLSHAUSEN). This representation is not merely *emphatic*, or only a reminiscence (MEYER), but *καὶ τὴν προφητικὴν ἐπήγαγε μαρτυρίαν* (THEODORET). So HARLESS and STIER in the main.

[The notion of opposition should not be too strongly pressed, though it is undoubtedly implied. As regards the allusion or citation from Psa. viii. 6, if it be regarded as a mere allusion the difficulty disappears; if it be a veritable citation, then we must adopt one of two conclusions:

* [Alford remarks: "Not only *time* present and to come, but the present earthly condition of things, and the future heavenly one." ELLICOTT: "With regard to the meaning of *αἰών* it may be observed that in all passages where it occurs, a *temporal* notion is more or less apparent. To this in the majority, an *ethical* idea is limited. In a few passages like the present a *semi-local* meaning seems also superadded, causing *αἰών* to approach in meaning to *κόσμος*, though it still may be always distinguished from it by the temporal and (commonly) ethical notions which ever form its back ground." Comp. chap. ii. 2; Gal. i. 4.—R.]

either the Psalm is in a certain sense *Messianic*, or Paul quotes in the *accommodating* manner which virtually destroys any specific meaning the Scriptures have. I prefer to adopt the former alternative, little fearing that too many Psalms will be accepted as Messianic. Paul's allusion is due "to a direct reference under the guidance of the Spirit to a passage in the O. T. which in its primary application to man involves a secondary and more profound application to Christ. In the grant of terrestrial sovereignty the Psalmist saw and felt the antitypical mystery of man's future exaltation in Christ" (ELLICOTT).—R.]

And gave him to be the head over all things to the church [*καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*].—Thus is set forth the *office* (SCHENKEL) of Christ, and the sphere of His efficiency. Αὐτὸν is in emphatic position, Him. Such an one, thus placed [thus exalted, thus glorified]. We must regard Him too as a gift, a present. *Διδόναι* is not=*τιθέναι*, the Apostle might otherwise have said *ἔθηκεν* or *κατέστησεν*; it is quite different in 1 Cor. xii. 28: "And God hath set (*ἔθετο*) some in the church." He gave Him to be "Head over all things to the church." We say with equal exactness: He gave Him to be Head, or as Head for the Church. As Head! not as *καρδιά*, but as *κεφαλή*. In the head lies the organizing power. SCHUBERT (*Geschichte der Seele*, p. 163) describes the relation of head and body "as a figure of a love, descending from above to beneath, grasping and moving the corporeal, and of a longing rising from below to above, the work of which it is, to constantly transform the lower nature of that which longs into the higher nature of that which is longed for." MARTIN Boos boldly says: "Christ dwelling in our humanity is as active as in that which He assumed from Mary." GERLACH beautifully says: "At once Ruler and Member of His Body." "Head" designates elsewhere superiority also (1 Cor. xi. 3).

The qualifying phrase "over all" is governed by "gave him to be head," and marks the might (*ὑπὲρ*) of this Head; *πάντα* is all without limitation, He is Head over *all—to the church*, to Christendom; "Head" is not to be supplied again (MEYER). The presence of *κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα* between *ἔδωκεν* and *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* does not at all alter the construction (against HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 117). The sense is precisely this: "Christ is such a Head of the Church, that He is for all that the Lord over all, over devils, world, *etc.*" (LUTHER). The whole economy of Creation stands at His disposal as the basis and sphere of activity for the economy of redemption (BECK). Accordingly *ὑπὲρ πάντα* is not to be joined *per trajectionem* to *αὐτόν* (*Syriac*, GREEK FATHERS, ERASMUS and others), nor is *ὑπὲρ πάντα* to be taken as meaning: above all the good which God has given stands this that He gave Christ as Head of the Church (CHRYSOSTOM), nor is it=*præcipue*, *μάλιστα πάντων* (BAUMGARTEN), nor=*ὑπερέχουσα πάντων*, *caput summum* (BEZA, RUECKERT: *Oberhaupt*, OLSH.: the prophets also were heads); nor are we to understand it of *bona virtutum* (ANSELM), or *dona gratiæ*, nor is "the natural limitation to be found in *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*" and this dative taken as *in commodum ecclesiæ*, for the Church (HARLESS). It is altogether unwarrantable to take the neuter for the masculine (JEROME, WAHL).

[The view of Braune is in the main that of modern English commentators. We must reject any sense of the verb but the simple one of "give," since the dative follows. Christ is given to the church—and given as *Head*, for the next clause renders this view imperative. The only trouble then is with "over all things;" what is His relation to them? Evidently that of Head also. No other view is admissible exegetically; the question becoming thus a purely grammatical one: Shall we accept a brachyology and understand a second *κεφαλήν* before *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* (MEYER, STIER, HODGE approvingly): "gave Him the Head over all things (to be the Head) to the church," or take *κεφαλήν* as a species of tertiary predicate (ALFORD, EADIE, ELLICOTT): "gave Him as Head over all things to the Church." The latter seems to be Braune's view, and is certainly the simpler grammatically. Nor does it throw out of view the grand thought that Christ is Head of the Church. ALFORD: "CHRIST is Head over all things: the Church is the BODY of Christ, and as such is the fulness of Him who fills all with all: the Head of such a Body, is Head over all things; therefore when God gives Christ as *Head* to the Church, He gives Him as *Head over all things* to the Church, from the necessity of the case."—R.]

The choice of the word *ἐκκλησία* for the Christian Church (iii. 10, 21; v. 23, 25, 27, 29, 32; Phil. iii. 6; 1 Cor. vi. 4; xii. 28) is very apt. GERHARD (*Loc. ed. Cotta.* X. 3, 20): *Chemnitius notat σύγκλησιν de primoribus, magnatibus, consulibus et eorum conventu, διάκλησιν de colluvie promiscuæ multitudinis quando fit congregatio ab agris, ἐκκλησίαν vero de civibus, quando σύνοδος τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν celebratur, eorum scilicet, qui certis legibus sibi devincti unius reipublicæ cives sunt. Appellatio igitur ecclesiæ ad populum Dei translata ostendit*, ECCLESIAM DEI NON ESSE COLLUVIEM PROMISCUÆ MULTITUDINIS, *sed eorum, qui certis legibus a Deo vocati et sibi invicem sunt obstricti. Athenis erant usitati duplices conventus, ἐκκλησίαι et ἀγοραί vel ἀγοραῖαι. Illæ significabant* CONVENTUS ORDINATOS, *quando universitas civium, eorum scilicet, qui jus civitatis habebant, ordine, justo, a magistratu convocati congregabantur; hæ vero significabant congregationes promiscuas et inordinatas, quando promiscua multitudo hominum in civitatibus et oppidis sine observatione ordinis in unum coibat.—Appellationi igitur ecclesiæ ad populum Dei translatæ inest significatio εὐταξίας καὶ εὐνομίας, qualis est in aristocratia civili, cui opponitur δημοκρατία, ἀκαταστασίας καὶ ἀταξίας plenissima.—Ut civitas non consistit ex medico et medico, aut ex rustico et rustico, sed ex medico et rustico, sicut Aristoteles in ethicis loquitur*, ITA QUOQUE ECCLESIA NON CONSTAT EX PASTORE ET PASTORE SEU EX AUDITORE ET AUDITORE, SED EX DOCENTIBUS ET DISCENTIBUS, ATQUE INTER IPSOS AUDITORES SUNT VARII VITÆ STATUS ATQUE ORDINES.

Accordingly the *ἐκκλησία* has two main features in it, one the *ordained unity* and the other the *calling*, which includes in itself a separating out (*ἐκλέγεσθαι*) from the world not yet called or rejecting the call, and which is consummated through *intellectual* means. See further under *Doctr. Note* 5.

Ver. 23. **Which is his body,** *ἥτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ*.—The pronoun *ὅστις* has an "explanatory element," introducing the statement of a reason, and is=the old German *als welcher*, "as which." So Rom. ii. 15: *οἵτινες= ut qui* (BEZA), *qui quidem ostendant* (CASTALIO); LUTHER renders it quite well: *damit dass sie beweisen*, and here: *welche da ist*. [ALFORD: *which same;* EADIE, ELLICOTT: *which indeed*. MEYER: "*ut quæ*, defining the attribute as belonging to the being of the church"—is perhaps too strong—though true enough.—R.] He is the Head of the church, since it is His Body, *τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ* (ii. 16; iv. 4, 12, 16; v. 23, 30; Col. i. 18, 24; ii. 19; iii. 15; Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 15; x. 17; xii 13, 27). From this citation of passages, in all of which this view of the Apostle is contained, the frequency of the figure, especially in this Epistle, may be seen. The membership making up the whole, the indispensableness of Christ and the vital fellowship with Him are marked. We must also remember, that here, on account of the *ἥτις*, only that is treated of, which the church is and has in Christ, and not what He has in it; this is only an inference, though a correct one, and remains in the background, should it enter at all.

[The questions, what constitutes the church? who are true members of the true church? do not enter here; but that Paul here teaches a mystical union, above and beyond any federal or representative union, or ethical union of thought and feeling, seems perfectly clear. We call this a figure, but is it not the reality, and the organic unity of the body the figure? Really and truly the church is the body of Christ, and out of this truth spring many lessons respecting our personal union with Christ. ALFORD: "It is veritably His body: not that which in our glorified humanity He personally bears, but that in which He, as the Christ of God, is manifested and glorified by spiritual organization. He is its Head; from Him comes its life; in Him, it is exalted; in it, He is lived forth and witnessed to; He possesses nothing for Himself,—neither His communion with the Father, nor His fulness of the Spirit, nor His glorified humanity,—but all for His Church, which is in the innermost reality, HIMSELF." Comp. Col. i. 24, which admits of no satisfactory explanation, unless we accept the fact that the Apostle was conscious of such a union as this.—R.]

The fulness of him who filleth all in all [*τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου*.]—As respects syntax, this is the intrusion of an apposition, forming a parallel clause, in order to express without a figure, what has just been figuratively explained: "fulness" corresponds to "body," "of Him filling all in all" to "His."

On *πλήρωμα*, comp. ver. 10 and PASSOW *sub voce*. Words ending in *—μός* as a rule represent the abstract action of the verb, those in *—μα* the concrete effect, so "that they are for the most part equivalent to the perfect participle passive" (BUTTMANN), like *πρᾶγμα, σπέρμα, κήρυγμα*, especially here *σῶμα* (*id quod σώζεται*). The word is not=*πλήρωσις*, the act of filling, but is to be taken in the passive sense: all that, or with which any thing is filled, the fulness. So here. [This simple passive sense is adopted by FRITZSCHE, DE WETTE, OLSHAUSEN, STIER, MEYER, and by ALFORD, EADIE, ELLICOTT ("that which is filled, the filled-up receptacle)." As the word was a favorite among the Gnostics (in after times however), so it has been a favorite plaything with commentators since, who have thrown not a little confusion upon its meaning. The simple passive sense is the most natural one; though perhaps not the most usual one, it is certainly allowable. The active sense, the filling up is adopted by HARLESS, who says there is no other sense used in the New Testament, in which view HODGE seems to acquiesce. But what is meant by the active sense: *implendi actionem*, or *id quod res impletur?* ELLICOTT speaks of the latter as passive, while HODGE evidently regards it as active (so Braune apparently under 2 below). ALFORD deems it a transition from the abstract sense, denying any active sense to such nouns, but saying that what is thus termed is "a logical transference from the effect to that which exemplifies the effect." From this it is evident how impossible it is to speak intelligibly about the word in its active and passive senses, until this meaning: *that by which any thing is filled*, is properly labelled. That is the work of the grammarian, yet it is evident that it is active or passive, according to the point of view: "whether one thinks first of the container, and then of the contained, or the reverse." HARLESS and HODGE are not justified in saying that the word is always used actively in the New Testament, though this sense is a common one.* It would give here the meaning *complement*, or *supplement*, which seems appropriate in view of the figure of Head and Body. But, on the other hand, this gives a sense which is so remarkable as to raise doubts; for how can Christ be filled by the church? Then again, we are almost forced by this interpretation to take the following participle in a passive sense, which is objectionable grammatically and logically. These reasons are strong enough to lead us to adopt the passive sense, which may be done without any fear of running counter to the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament.—R.]

Nor does the difficulty lie in the genitive: *τοῦ πληρουμένου*, which refers to Christ. The participle is middle, and, as usage requires in the case of such correlated words, is used in the same sense as the preceding noun: of Him who fills from out Himself, through Himself (WINER, p. 242), or fills for Himself (FRITZSCHE: *qui sibi complet*). [The latter sense is adopted by MEYER (in 4th edition, Braune quotes him as accepting a deponent sense), ELLICOTT, EADIE. This reciprocal sense seems to have escaped the notice of Dr. HODGE, who agrees with ALFORD in accepting the active sense, though he admits it is favored only by classical usage. Certainly the active meaning of the participle is not so justi-

* [In many of the instances specified by HODGE, the passive sense is equally allowable. For example, chap. i. 10, "the fulness of the times" may as well be taken as meaning the state of being full on the part of the appointed periods of time, as that which fills up those periods, and so in Gal. iv. 4; Eph. iii. 19: "the fulness of God" affords a much better sense if taken passively (see in *loco*), while Mark viii. 20: "the fulnesses of how many baskets," refers not to what fills up the baskets, but "the state of fulness as respects the baskets."—R.]

fiable as the passive sense of the noun *πλήρωμα*.—R.] The present tense must also be taken into the account: He is conceived of in the process of filling; whether He succeeds, the result will show; the process is now *going on.*

The real difficulty lies in *τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν*, "all in all." The object *τὰ παντα*, is of course, in accordance with what precedes, to be referred to the entire world of creatures, which Christ fills, naturally as a soul the body, the former however working out beyond the latter, not exclusively in and upon it, and not only working, but being actively present, hence not as blood fills the heart, or water a vessel. "All" is filled by Christ, as is the Church, His Body, hence not mechanically, chemically, or the like. The most difficult point still remains: *ἐν πᾶσιν*, "in all." The preposition *ἐν* joined with *πληροῦσθαι* and *πλήρωμα* must designate that *in* which He fills; if this is inconceivable, then the Apostle must and would have expressed himself otherwise. Accordingly the neuter cannot be accepted here, since then *idem per idem* would be asserted, or an exaggeration occur: *Alles in Allem* [*all things in all things*, see below under (7.)—R.] Following the rule, that those cases which belong to both genders (*πάντων*, *πᾶσι*) are to be taken as masculine, unless the context absolutely requires the neuter, we render: *in Allen*, "in all persons" (so LUTHER originally, but "*in Allem*" afterwards crept in); it thus marks His filling efficiency in persons, in heavenly spirits and human souls, of which also His relation as Head of the Church obliges us to think. He is the central Personality, working through all things, working in all. Such a Head has the Church, the central sphere of the world which is to be perfected (STIER).* This explanation is in no particular without supporters, but there is also no incorrect explanation possible which has not been made here.

(1.) The *connection* is viewed incorrectly, by joining the parallel clause "the fulness," etc., with "him" (ver. 22), and taking "which is his body" as parenthetical (ERASMUS), when it is too important to admit of this. BENGEL, too, following SEMLER, is incorrect: "*Hoc neque de ecclesia prædicatur, ut plerique censent, neque, ut aliis visum, cum* DEDIT *construitur, sed absolute ponitur accusativo casu, uti τὸ μαρτύριον*, 1 Tim. ii. 6. *Est enim epiphonema eorum, quæ a ver.* 20 *dicuntur, innuitque apostolus, in Christo esse* PLENITUDINEM *patris omnia implentis in omnibus.*"

(2.) *Πλήρωμα* is taken in the active sense as *supplementum.* So the GREEK FATHERS, ESTIUS, CALVIN, BEZA ("*ut sciamus Christum per se non* INDIGERE *hoc supplemento, ut qui efficiat omnia in omnibus revera*," even HARLESS, who holds with BAEHR as the undoubted result of investigation, that *πλήρωμα* is used in the New Testament only in its active sense, says: "She is the fulness of Christ, not as though she were the glory which dwells in Him, but because He permits His glory, as in all, so to dwell in her; she is the glory, not of one who would be in want without her, but of Him who fills all in all parts," so HOFMANN (*Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 118-120). Even STIER points to this, bringing it over out of the *middle* form; yet this is not *se implere, se supplere*, but *sibi.* It is quite as incorrect to take it as= *πλῆθος* (HESYCHIUS, WAHL: *copia cultorum Dei sive Christi*, SCHÖTTGEN: *multitudo, cui Christus præest*).—RUECKERT, too, who is helpless here, is in error, in taking the Church, *πλήρωμα*, as the means of filling for Christ's executive efficiency, since the Church can do nothing without Him.—The explanation of CAMERON is a curiosity: full bodily mass.*

(3.) The participle *τοῦ πληρουμένου* is taken as *passive* (CHRYSOSTOM, *Vulgate*); *ἀντὶ τοῦ πληροῦντος* (THEODORET, ŒKUMENIUS, OLSHAUSEN, HARLESS); as *deponent* (MEYER). BENGEL remarks: "*i. e., πληροῦντος; sed major vis mediæ vocis, in denotanda relatione ejus, qui implet et eorum, qui implentur*"—quite correct!

(4.) The *meaning* of the verb is certainly not: to make complete (*Vulgate*, ESTIUS: *adimpletur*).

(5.) As regards the *subject* of the verb, HARLESS, referring to THEODORET: *τοῦ μὲν Χριστοῦ σῶμα, τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς πλήρωμα—οἰκεῖ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ* (*ἐκκλησίᾳ*) *καὶ ἐμπεριπατεῖ κατὰ τὴν προφητικὴν φωνὴν* says: it *must* be referred to Christ, while STIER, who founds his proof less on the passage in question than on the organism of the Epistle, says: God *must* be considered the subject. [So ALFORD, but the great majority of commentators adopt the other reference.—R.]

(6.) *Τὰ πάντα* has been limited to the members of the Church, to members of the body of Christ (ESTIUS, STIER), to the spiritual results wrought by Christ, or the Christian's faculties of soul (GROTIUS: *Christus in omnibus* (*credentibus*) *implet omnia, mentem luce, voluntatem piis affectibus, corpus ipsum obsequendi facultate*), to different peoples, nations (FLATT, MORUS).

(7.) The preposition *ἐν* is taken as instrumental (MEYER). [ALFORD: "The thing with, or by, or in which as an element, the filling takes place. So that the expression will mean, *with all*, not only gifts, not only blessings, but things." So ELLICOTT, who thus explains the whole verse: "The Church is the veritable mystical Body of Christ, yea the recipient of the plenitudes of Him who filleth all things, whether in heaven or in earth, with all the things, elements, and entities, of which they are composed." This view accepts *πᾶσιν* as neuter, and is on the whole preferable to every other interpretation, unless that of Braune be an exception. See above.—R.]

* [This interpretation is very plausible, and commends itself especially on account of the view it takes of the preposition *ἐν*. As *τὰ πάντα* immediately precedes, too much stress should not be laid on the rule mentioned above respecting the choice of the masculine. But I fully share in Dr. Braune's dislike for the *instrumental* sense of *ἐν* (taking it as=*per*). One who has been puzzled by the E. V., which accepts this as one of its most usual significations, and seen how often commentators pass over it without notice, must feel that for so small a word, it has suffered more at the hands of its friends than any other in the Greek Testament. It is a good rule: never render *ἐν*, *by* if any other possible meaning accords with the context. ALFORD and ELLICOTT refer to chap. v. 18, in support of the instrumental sense, but it is very doubtful even there. If we take *ἐν*=*in* here, then the *πᾶσιν* must be accepted as masculine, for the neuter would not allow of any intelligible meaning, especially in view of the well-known phrase *τὰ πάντα*, the *universe.* See under (7) however.—R.]

* [HARLESS takes *πλήρωμα* as expressing the *Divine glory*=*Shekinah*, but that is objectionable for reasons both lexical and logical.—EADIE refers to the view of MICHAELIS and BRETSCHNEIDER (=*quasi templum in quo habitat, quod occupat et regit, ut anima corpus*), but this and kindred interpretations are all either too limited or too specific. Just here it becomes us to be cautious.—R.]

(8) Πᾶσιν is taken as neuter and rendered: *in all parts* (HARLESS and others), or in all places, everywhere (FLATT). BENGEL (*neutrum, masculini potestatem*) does not belong here, nor does he waver; he refers it to μέλεσι τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, to persons. It is also taken adverbially: ἐν παντί (JEROME: *sicut adimpletur imperator, si quotidie ejus augetur exercitus—ita et—Christus—sic tamen, ut omnia adimpleantur in omnibus, i. e., ut qui in eum credunt, cunctis virtutibus pleni sint*). Indeed, πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν has been taken adverbially (SCHÖTTGEN: *omnia omnino*), or referred to the eternal (HOLZHAUSEN).

(9.) It is entirely groundless to find a polemic purpose here, especially an account of the word πλήρωμα used afterwards by the Gnostics also (MEIER, BAEHR).

(10.) Quite as groundless is the assumption that the ubiquity of the glorified Body is taught here (CALOVIUS).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. God, whose power and glory is so exceeding great (ver. 19), at whose command and disposal are all things, even Christ, whom He raised and exalted above all heavenly and earthly, personal and unpersonal powers (vers. 20–22), works *freely*, but without arbitrariness, *conditioning* Himself, upon men—not without faith (ver. 19), not without Christ (vers. 22, 23), so that the prayer also (vers. 16, 17: ἵνα), which is offered believingly in the name of Christ, has a prospect of being granted. Precisely in the *work of Redemption* is manifested the worshipful glory of God, who in self-conditioning love moderates Himself, lowers and limits Himself, in order to employ and to show His unbounded love, to impart of His nature and to make blessed. His whole power, strength, might and efficacy stand in the service of His love.

2. *Christ*, who as to His human nature has in His Father His God (ver. 17), is our Lord, the Head of His Church, at the right hand of Gôd in glory, of unlimited power over angels and men, ministering and hostile spirits, as well as over the economy of the creation and of salvation. He cannot be put down to the level of Divine humanity and God likeness. Yet our section says nothing of His state of humiliation, speaks only of His state of exaltation, beginning with the resurrection from the dead, refers to the humanity, which He assumed, appropriated, and did not afterwards relinquish,* only that in what the Father did in Him, we might have a standard for what the Almighty God, who through Him is our Father, will and shall do and work in us (vers. 19, 20: εἰς ἡμᾶς—κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν—ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ). He is the Head, to whom there will not be wanting a body, which He will prepare for Himself; He cannot be a "mere Head." But he has also no *vicar*, such as the Pope. *Sancta enim Christiana sive Catholica ecclesia consistere absque* ISTO *capite optime potest et constitisset certe rectius, ac melius cum ea ageretur, nisi diabolus illud caput in medium projecisset et exaltasset* (*Articles of Smalkald*).

3. *The connection between creation and redemption* is presupposed here; the two spheres do not fall asunder; Christ, the acme in both, holds them together; the former must serve the latter (vers. 21–23).

4. *Respecting the angels*, who are included in ver. 21. "over above all principality, and power, and might, and lordship," it is only indicated that they are *personalities*, and affirmed that they *have power and might*. From the series of these designations, which can scarcely be taken as a descending climax [though this is the most plausible hypothesis—R.], nothing can be inferred as to the ranks or groups of angels.* ["On the nature of angels, consult the able treatise by TWESTEN, *Dogmatik*, Vol. II. especially § 1, 4, the essay by STUART, *Bibliotheca Sacra* for 1843, p. 88–154, EBRARD, *Dogmatik*, § 228 sq., Vol. I. p. 276, and the remarks of LANGE, *Leben Jesu*, Part II. p 41 f." (ELLICOTT).—All that is expressed is well set forth by WESLEY: "We know that the king is above all, though we cannot name all the officers of his court. So we know that Christ is above all, though we are not able to name all His subjects."—R.]

5. *The Church*. On this subject our section teaches more. As regards its origin the name ἐκκλησία (ver. 22), "the calling of God" (ver. 18) show what is indicated by "Head" or "gave Him to be Head" (ver. 22) viz.: The Church results not from a physical or purely world-historical process without the creative power and fatherly love of God; it is His work, His gracious gift, and indeed His Word is efficient therein, Christ, also, as the Eternal Word, as the power organizing the whole (τὸ σῶμα), through the word, as the *intellectual* means of the ingathering. The *extent* of the Church is also pointed out in two directions:

a) *On earth:* "the faith which is among you in the Lord Jesus" (ver. 15) and "to us-ward who believe" (ver. 19)—the faith in Jesus, wrought in men through the word, describes the domain of the Church: *where* (καθ' ὑμᾶς) faith is there is the Church, the congregation, even if it is wanting in particular persons or in many. The extent is not to be limited by Donatist or Anabaptist notions of the Church; she has, according to the purity of the word, the power of the preaching, the vitality of the faith, her degrees, *quo purior et sincerior est verbi prœdicatio, eo etiam purior est ecclesiæ status* (JOHN GERHARD, *Loc.* XI. p. 195). But it should not be said, that there is no Church where sinners are and are tolerated (*Anabaptists*, SCHWENKFELD and others).

b) *On earth and in heaven:* "the fulness of Him who filleth all in all" (ver. 23); she is not merely a temporal institution, within the visible world, she embraces men after as well as before death. "Of all the names which the Church can and does bear, not one is so immeasurably

* [We must hold fast, especially in view of the local reference in ver. 20 to the truth of Christ's actual bodily presence in heaven, over against the Lutheran doctrine of the ubiquity of His humanity (Form. Conc. II. 8). Comp. the implied opposition to this dogma in the Heidelberg Catechism, Q. 47, 48, 80 (apparently inserted afterwards). The Eucharistic controversies of the 16th century made of this a battle-field. —R.]

* [The so-called revelations of modern "spiritualism" do not seem to have shed much light on the few passages of Scripture which treat of angels. Nor do they attempt to do so. One might infer something from this fact, as to the question whether these revelations, granting them a supernatural origin, have the same origin as the statements of Scripture.—R.]

deep and yet so transparently clear, so sharply defined and yet so inexhaustibly rich, at once so real and spiritual, external and internal, obvious and mysterious as this one: she is the *Body of Christ.* It is this name and no other, which the New Testament Church has not in common with the Old Testament Church, and in which all her superiority over the latter is included; *time and eternity, suffering and glory, blessing and curse,* for all over whom the name of Christ is named, lie in its lap, and itself a riddle, to be first solved hereafter, yet all the riddles proposed to us by the present life find in it their solution" (DELITZSCH).

The *completion* of the Church is an object of the Divine government of the world, and has begun here in Christendom by the path of faith, to which the inheritance in the saints is certain (vers. 18, 19, 23).

6. *Faith* has its *ground* "in the Lord Jesus (ver. 15), its place of manifestation in the Church (καθ' ὑμᾶς, ver. 15), its *worth* and its *position* before love (ver. 15), its *importance* and *value* for God, who requires it as the condition of salvation (ver. 19: "to us-ward who believe"), from which may be inferred at the same time, that it has different *degrees*, since the Apostle joins together himself and others, also since the participle is present, that it is not to be conceived of as an act once for all, but as "a continuing *life-movement* to be constantly renewed."

7. Beside faith stands *love*, which is germinally included in the former, since this "is an act of self-emptying and surrender to a gracious God," who is Love. But it is not to be regarded as a virtue, by means of which we become well-pleasing to the beloved Love; it comes into existence with faith, which lays hold of the righteousness of Christ, and thus attains to righteousness before God, and is the mother of all virtues. —In the phrase "unto all the saints" no limitation can be perceived, since he who loves *all* the members of the Church. the orthodox and the erring too, will imitate his Lord Jesus, the Good Samaritan of the world in Samaritan love (Luke, x. 37: "Go thou and do likewise"). The context leads only to this emphasizing of love.

8. *The ground of hope* is the calling of God and its *goal* the "inheritance" of God. It comes from above, points and looks upward; it lifts us out of the natural ego and above the visible world about us.*

9. *Knowledge* is both *path* (ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, ver. 17) and *goal* (εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι, ver. 18); it is a matter capable of growth, for it has but to ponder the thoughts of the eternal, creative God. Man's knowledge is not perfect within the domain of creation, still less can he know the things of the invisible world. Only by *living* in a sphere does he gather knowledge of what is found there; knowledge comes from experience of occurrences. Without a disposition of the heart the sense of the understanding is not enlarged and sharpened. *Sensible, mental, spiritual* knowledge refers to life-spheres, in which he who knows must move. Only the believing, loving, longing one knows and grows in knowledge unto knowledge.

10. *The prayer of the Apostle* has it *starting-point* in what God has given, and its *goal* in what God should give. From thankful acknowledgment, he proceeds to requests, petitions; with the faith and love of the church before his eyes, he rises to supplication for the spirit of wisdom and revelation, for wider knowledge of what God is, on behalf of their inner life. This occurs daily. Thus have we all, ministers and members of the church, especially the former, to learn, in order to practise it, what furthers the Kingdom of God in general and in particular: *such prayer is a means of grace* full of blessing for those who offer it, as well as for those for whom it is offered.

11. The *consummation* in the case of individuals is *conditioned* by the church and conditions its consummation. Hence "His inheritance in the saints" (ver. 18). Outside the church we do not advance, nor salvation become ours, whatever we may be, or accrue to us, wherever we stand; it is a gift, for which we must be prepared. The fulness of the gift and our perfection finally coincide.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

It is a joy, when in social circles one hears from another, just as of city and state events, so especially of the kingdom of God, the church of Christ, of the faith and love of Christians.—We should not judge the faith of particular persons in a church, but rejoice in the faith within the church, though it be only among the minority; so long as there is believing preaching, supplication for all that concerns the church, order in the administration of the sacraments, grace at table and family worship, use of the best hymns, since we have so many poor ones, and many another sign of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ in the church, a stranger who does not know the individuals at all, may and ought to rejoice therein and speak thereof.—Love to *all* Christians! As we must pray every Sunday for love toward *all men*, so love to *all Christians* is not so easily brought about. The orthodox, pietists, and those who deal earnestly with God's word and the confessions of the church, are least likely to encounter love from those, who regard themselves as precisely the liberal Christians; such fall in much more readily with those who are against the Church of Christ than with these. Always reckon among "all Christians" those first, who are to you the most unpleasant, thus you will best perceive the weight of this injunction and your own weakness.—Who of us always begins his prayers with thanksgiving, as did the Apostle? We rather pray for what we lack, than thank for what we have received. This should not be.

Men rejoice much, if they are thought of at a distance; they part well-nigh always with the

---

* [MEYER: "Notice here, too, the three fundamental elements of subjective Christianity: *Faith* and *Love* and *Hope* (vers. 15, 18); in *faith* and *love* the illumination through the Holy Ghost should ever bring more and more to our knowledge the glory of our *hope*; for the Christians' πολίτευμα is in heaven (Phil. iii. 20), whither their entire "minding" and "seeking" is directed. The centre of Christianity is still faith with its love, in connection with which, however, *hope* ever, encouragingly and inspiritingly, holds up the constant *goal*." He adduces this against WEISS, who seeks to discover here special prominence given to hope "entirely after the Petrine mode," which as that author thinks makes "hope" the centre.—R.]

request: Remember me! It is something beyond this, when such remembrance rises into intercession, and one remembers the absent, not merely pleasantly or listlessly, in conversation with men, but devoutly in prayer to God.—Without knowledge we do not attain to knowledge; only in the light do we see light. The Apostle does not indeed preach the Word of learning or science, but still it is spoken against ignorance, indiscretion, narrowness. Only that the centre of man, the *heart* and temper with the will be open to the light, to knowledge!—As the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom (Ps. cxi. 10), so the starting point for this is insight into our misery and poverty; poor human beings generally swell out with their own worth, and just in this way fritter away what they have of God's gifts. We must in the end seek our worth above, if we would find it; else we get into a pitiful satisfaction.

The three most important objects of our knowledge: 1. God's *call*—in our need; 2. God's *heritage*—in our *heart;* 3. God's *strength*—in our *longing* and *striving.*—As the world needs revelation beside the wisdom from experience, so a man also needs besides wisdom and prudence the private revelation to teach what and how he should act and suffer and bear.—Our hope rests on Christ in God. What the Father, to whom Christ in His holy humanity prayed, praying as to His God, has done to Him, *in* and *upon* Him, when He exalted Him from the dead to His right hand, that shall occur to thee, since He works *upon thee*, yet only in proportion to thy faith in thy Saviour.—Be, become and remain a member of the Church which is His Body! Those are *beheaded* rather, who deny the Lord to save their heads, than those who in holy martyrdom lost their heads, to remain with their Head.

STARKE:—Faith has to do with the gospel, love with the law. Faith takes, love gives; the former has the benefits, the latter the duties.—We must not seek the saints only in heaven, for they are certainly already on the earth. The imperfection of sanctification and holiness does not deny the truth of these things.—See here, how a preacher should remember his congregation before God in prayer!—As it is one of the signs and duties of a faithful teacher, now to thank and now to pray to God for his congregation, so it is not less the characteristic of a good hearer, to give the teacher, whose intercession he will confidently expect as a blessing to himself, great cause for thanksgiving.—The possessions of our glorious inheritance are so great and excellent, that no man can understand them without the illumination of the Holy Ghost.—The mere science of the letter in Divine things, obtained by the natural powers of godless people is no real enlightenment nor proper knowledge of Jesus Christ.—The call to the kingdom of God must stand at the basis of every external calling which we have in our sphere of life, that we may master it.—Conversion is a great and almighty work of God, hence not the power of man, nor consisting in a mere thought of the brain, but is a great change of soul, since all its powers are turned away from sin and the world to heaven and God.—Lazarus was awakened by Christ with a word, but how many sermons did He use to awaken the spiritually dead Jews, and yet they would not let themselves be awakened. God's power and grace for the conversion of man is in itself infinite, yet He will force no man, but leaves him the freedom to resist.—The Christian Church is the Body of Christ and hence closely united with Him. She receives all her fulness from Him; from Him, the Head, flows all strength into the members. Although she here finds herself surrounded with much weakness and misery, yet is she still glorious in her Head, who already reigns in glory.

A. H. FRANCKE:—This then is also wisdom, to know that we cannot be wise unless there be a God and we can receive it from Him in answer to *prayer.* The Apostle does *not* say, he wishes that a university might be established in the city of Ephesus, in which many professors would take positions, that by this means the people might be made wise,—but: that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom.

RIEGER:—Beside the glances into the distance and the hope of our calling in the invisible and eternal, beside the insight into the economy of God, without us, we must not disregard the insight into the necessary truths learned by experience of God's work of grace within us, that each do their part in making the heart steadfast and full of confidence and love. If a man thinks of the depth of his fall, the throng and deceit of his foes, the powerful hindrances to his salvation, then he may well desire to look into the greatness of the power of God, which is employed in his calling and preservation unto blessedness.—In faith we can most precisely notice, how God applies His transcendent might and yet how man is not overcome by it in a violent manner, but is so disposed, that he can maintain his convictions, his love for light, his obedience under its influence.—Believing is opposed by the love of our own life so deeply inherent in us, by so many offences occurring to us in the world's ways; therefore it requires the working of His mighty strength. This power of God and its effect is indeed still concealed in us, covered up by our weaknesses, and behind the curtain of the flesh not yet fully to be judged; but in Jesus Christ it has already attained to victory.—The Head and the Body together make a whole; in the church is seen the fulness of Him who filleth all in all; Christ applies the fulness of the Godhead dwelling in Him to the completing and perfecting of this His church; He does not leave her until He has also fulfilled all that is well-pleasing to God, and presented her, blameless, filled with all the fruits of righteousness.—He who stands in vital fellowship with Him, has all things.—All that is not yet disclosed to you, remains yours still in this fulness.

PASSAVANT:—Do you detect no result of this Divine power in you, no new life from God, or no hunger and thirst after deliverance out of the old nature into the new nature of the friends of the Lord; oh, do not trust yourself, do not trust thy best thoughts, thy most beautiful feelings, thy noblest strivings, thy best beliefs, for there is also a vain, a false, self-made, fancied faith, a faith leading to God as little as coming from God.—Are they holy and good, those powers, Jesus

is still more holy and glorious above them; and have they on God's account, as is the case, as angels of light an influence upon the worlds of God, upon the earth, upon us, they receive from Christ their power and strength, they stand under His supreme influence; He directs them, He equips them. Are they unholy and evil, those powers, even here Jesus will have power and maintain authority; will punish their evil nature, will restrain their corrupting influence and destroy their power, aye, has already, as the Dying and Crucified One, broken and destroyed their power.—*All in all:* In the angels of His power, in the glorified righteous, in His saints, and all the Blessed, their only clear and heavenly radiance, their Divine joy, their eternal peace, their blessedness, their glory. All in all: Among the angels of disobedience, about the unrighteous, the ungodly and the damned, for all the Light shining with eternal rays of anxiety and terror through their darkness; the eye, that with a flame of fire searches forever through their inmost nature; the power, that always from without and from within tends them with a rod of iron; the word, the eternal word, judging and condemning them in their own hearts, ever anew, ever more penetratingly, more irrevocably, more awfully. All in all: In all His worlds, from the lowest to the highest degrees, in all powers and glories, from the smallest to the most exalted of constellations, of suns, which excel all others in clearness and glory. He is the Divine, infinite fulness of light, of life, from out which they gladly rise in His heavens.

Heubner:—Thanksgiving and prayer are the inward emotions of a holy mind, the inward holy choir.—Only what proceeds from God's revelation, which is attested to man by the illumination of the Holy Ghost, is true wisdom. Every one must have his own revelation of Christianity, for he should not believe on the testimony of a stranger.—The Christian knows not only his misery, but also his blessedness, how rich and glorious is the inheritance ordained by God for the saints, and from the greatness of his blessedness he knows the greatness of Divine grace. All this can be known and valued only by an enlightened eye, because it has not the dazzling glitter of earthly things. The evil spirit blinds man, so that he does not perceive how great is the blessedness won by Christ, so that he in his blindness thinks this disturbs his happiness and lays a yoke upon him.—God's mental power shows itself in what He has made out of man, in the transformation of the single sinner as well as of the heathen world. What philosopher could have suspected this? What did Apollonius accomplish? Nothing, save that the next generation held him to be what he was, a charlatan.—The resurrection of Christ is a token of spiritual life, of the regeneration of humanity, to take place through the Risen and Exalted Christ.—Christ is the Lord of the whole world of spirits, visible and invisible; He has authority over all ruling powers in heaven and on earth. Paul's words are an amplification of Matth. xxviii. 18.—This heavenly King is given to the Church as Head; she is committed to Him *in specie;* over her He has immediate oversight and care; she is to Him the dearest of all, because He has bought her with His own blood.—The Church is the Body of Christ, she is a communion, entirely permeated by His Spirit, the members being animated and controlled by His Spirit; she is the very centre of His efficiency.

Stier:—The most powerful and yet most humble way of exhorting is with this introduction: I pray for thee!—No thanksgiving without petition, so long as perfection and completeness are not yet there.—Our state of grace does not indeed begin with this deeper insight, but only through this does it indeed advance: may all preachers then learn from the Apostles, to work properly in their sermons and in their congregations for this end.—The Spirit of God cannot begin entirely without knowledge, nor work through dim feeling toward new will and life.—Illumination is not itself as yet sanctification, but is the immediately vital transition thereto from faith, which is at first, in and before experience, a matter of knowledge.—*To know God*—the highest aim of all wisdom of the spirit.—In the heart is all decided, faith, insight, desire, will.—The Apostle unfolds and portrays the supremacy of the Exalted One in the domain of *power,* especially in the kingdom of grace, of the Spirit, making alive again the dead in sin on the earth, *in the church.*—In this world there are many names before God and Christ, that we do not know or name, but hereafter we shall learn them.—Church is the assembly or unity of those called to the fellowship of salvation in Christ; it is the growing, developing body of Christ.

Leupold (*Sermons for Whitsunday* on vers. 15-19): *The heavenly gifts, in which the children of God rejoice with praise to-day.* 1) The *grace* of God, enriching us in the knowledge of salvation; 2) The *power* of God, causing this knowledge to become a might; 3) The *faithfulness* of God, carrying forward the good work already begun to the blessed goal.—*How do we prove ourselves thankful for the outpouring of the Holy Ghost and His gifts?* 1) By our knowing His gifts better; 2) ever imploring them more faithfully for ourselves and others; 3) by letting ourselves be filled by them and their power become more perceptible and precious in us.—*What are the Christian's festival petitions?* 1) That he may grow in the knowledge of salvation; 2) that he may grow in fellowship with the Saviour and all saints; 3) that he may not forget to give thanks for the unmerited favors of God.—*The high significance of the Pentecostal gift:* 1) It comes from the Lord; prayer is its condition; 2) In it the Lord comes to us; knowledge of God and His plan of salvation, of Christ and His saving work, is its proof; 3) Through it we come to the Lord; living faith, working in love is its crown.—*The fellowship of believers, holy and glorious:* 1) The spirit of revelation endows it; 2) Faith in the Lord Jesus founds it; 3) Love to all saints strengthens it; 4) Fraternal intercession crowns it.

Winter (vers. 20-23):—*The ascension of Christ His exaltation to the right hand of God in heaven:* 1. Let us so consider it. 2. Let us perceive the transcendent consolation therein inherent for us: *a*) now is He properly attested as our Saviour and Deliverer; *b*) now we know, not only that He still lives, but has power to defend us and His kingdom; *c*) now we may cheerfully go

there too. 3. The high and holy duties proceeding from this: *a*) that we obey Him in all things; *b*) commit to Him ourselves and our whole life; *c*) seek not what is below, but what is above, and have our conversation in heaven.—*Christ all in all!* 1) The Lord of all in heaven; 2) the Almighty Head of His Church on earth.

[HODGE:—In praying that the Ephesians might be enlightened with spiritual apprehensions of the truth, the Apostle prays for their sanctification. In praying that they might have just conceptions of the inheritance to which they were called, he prayed that they might be elevated above the world. And in praying that they might know the exceeding greatness of the power exercised in their conversion, he prayed that they might be at once humble and confident,—humble, in view of the death of sin from which they had been raised; and confident, in view of the omnipotence of that God who had begun their salvation.

[EADIE:—Ver. 15. Community of faith begets community of feeling, and this brother-love is an instinctive emotion, as well as an earnest obligation. In that spiritual temple which the Spirit is rearing in the sanctified bosom, faith and love are the Jachin and Boaz, the twin pillars that grace and support the structure.—Ver. 16. The Apostle, though he had visited them, does not felicitate himself on his pastoral success among them, but gives thanks on this account to God.—The Apostle gave thanks, and his thanks ended in prayer.—Ver. 17. It is only when the prayerful study of the Bible is blessed by spiritual influence that wisdom is acquired.—This knowledge of God concerns not the works of His creation, which is but the "time-vesture" of the Eternal, but the grace and the purposes of His heart, His possession and exhibition of love and power.—Ver. 18. If the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of God be conferred, then the scales fall from the moral vision, and the cloudy haze that hovers round it melts away.—Not only had they been the objects of God's affection—but also, and especially, of God's power. Infinite love prompted into operation omnipotent strength.—Ver. 19. If the resurrection of Jesus be the normal exhibition of Divine power, other similar exhibitions are pledged to Christ's people.—Ver. 20. The specimen and pledge of that power displayed in quickening us, is Christ's resurrection. 1. It is transcendent power. 2. It is power already experienced by believers. 3. It is resurrectionary power, displayed in restoring life. 4. The resurrection of Jesus is in this respect not merely a specimen or illustration—it is also a pledge. Present spiritual life and future resurrection are both involved.—Jesus was placed at the Father's "right hand." 1. It is the place of honor. 2. It is the place of power. 3. It is the place of happiness—happiness possessed, and happiness communicated.—Ver. 22. The brow once crowned with thorns now wears the diadem of universal sovereignty; and that hand, once nailed to the cross, now holds in it the sceptre of unlimited dominion. He who lay in the tomb has ascended the throne of unbounded empire. Jesus, the brother-man, is Lord of all: He has had all things put under His feet—the true apotheosis of humanity.—The history of the church is a proof extending through eighteen centuries; a proof so often tested, and by such opposite processes, as to gather irresistible strength with its age; a proof varied, ramified, prolonged, and unique, that the exalted Jesus is Head over all things to the church.—Ver. 23. Head and body are correlative, and are organically connected. There is first a connection of life—at the same time a connection of power,—and, in fine, a connection of sympathy.—The Head of the Church is at the same time Lord of the Universe. While He fills the Church fully with those blessings which have been won for it and are adapted to it, He also fills the universe with all such gifts as are appropriate to its welfare—gifts which it is now His exalted prerogative to bestow.—R.]

B. The extent and mission of the church.

CHAPTER II. 1–22.

1. *Reminder of the previous condition of death and the glorious new creation.*

(CHAP. II. 1–10.)

1 And you *hath he quickened*, who were dead in trespasses and sins [You also who
2 were dead in your[1] trespasses and your sins]; Wherein in time past ye [Wherein
ye once] walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of
the power [or powers][2] of the air, [of] the spirit that [which] now worketh in the
3 children [sons] of disobedience: Among whom also [even] we all had our conversation [way of life] in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires [doing the wishes] of the flesh and of the mind [thoughts]; and [we] were by nature[3]
4 the children of wrath, even as others [the rest:—]. But God, who is [being] rich

5 in mercy, for [because of] his great love wherewith he loved us, Even when we were
dead in sins [our trespasses], hath [*omit* hath][4] quickened us together with Christ,
6 (by grace ye are [have been] saved;) And hath [*omit* hath] raised *us* up together
[with *Him*],[5] and made *us* sit together [with *Him*] in [the] heavenly *places* in
7 Christ Jesus: That in the ages to come he might shew [That he might shew forth
in the ages which are to come][6] the exceeding riches[7] of his grace, in *his* [*omit his*]
8 kindness toward us, through [toward us in][8] Christ Jesus. For by grace are ye
9 [have ye been] saved through faith;[9] *it is* the gift of God [the gift is God's]. Not
10 of works, lest any [that no] man should boast. For we are his workmanship
[his handiwork are we][10], created in Christ Jesus unto [for] good works, which
God hath before ordained [God before prepared] we should walk in them.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 1.—[The pronoun ὑμῶν is found in ℵ. B. D. F.; accepted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott. It is omitted in *Rec.*, K. L.; bracketted by Alford, rejected by Braune, but it seems unlikely to have been inserted, since the articles are sufficiently explicit. They justify at all events the above rendering.—On *also* instead of *and*, the meaning of *in*, and the anacoluthon, see *Exeg. Notes.*—R.]—B. reads ἐπιθυμίαις instead of ἁμαρτίαις.

[2] Ver. 2.—[The word ἐξουσίας is generally taken collectively. It means here either *empire* (so Ellicott renders) or *powers* (Four Ang. clergymen). The latter least disturbs the E. V., and gives an excellent sense.—*Of* must be inserted before "spirit," to show that it is not in apposition with "prince," as the E. V. assumes.—*Sons* is more literal than "children," and serves to distinguish υἱοί from τέκνα (ver. 2).—R.]

[3] Ver. 3.—Instead of τέκνα φύσει [*Rec.*] in ℵ. B. and others, A. D. E. F. G. and others read φύσει τέκνα; an evident transposition, to take φύσει from between two words belonging together. [Most modern editors retain the order of the *Rec.*—Alford accepts ἤμεθα (ℵ. B.) instead of ἦμεν (*Rec.*, A. D. F. K. L., most editors).—Ellicott has been followed in the emendations of the English text.—R.]

[4] Ver. 5.—[The aorist should be rendered by the English past, here and ver. 6, while the peculiar and emphatic ἐστε σεσωσμένοι, ye have been and (still are) saved, seems to require the perfect here, where a series of past acts are brought in review.—We substitute *our trespasses* for *sins*, because παραπτώμασιν is usually rendered thus, the article having in this instance almost the force of our possessive pronoun.—B. has a number of various readings in this verse, inserting ἐν before τοῖς παραπτώμασιν, which is an evident gloss. On *in* see the parallel expression, ver. 1.—R.]

[5] Ver. 6.—[*In Him* is preferable to *together*, bringing out more exactly the force of συν in the compound verbs.—R.]

[6] Ver. 7.—The whole verse is wanting in ℵ.; yet added very early. [The order of the E. V. is unfortunate, since the emphasis rests on the verb *shew forth*. The fuller expression: *the ages which are to come*, seems to be required by the full form of the Greek.

[7] Ver. 7.—[The *Rec.* (with D.[3] K. L.) gives the masculine form. The neuter is found in A. B. D.[1] F., added in ℵ., accepted by nearly all modern editors.—R.]

[8] Ver. 7.—[The E. V. as so often incorrectly renders ἐν, *through*. The comma should be omitted, as the phrase is either part of a compound modal clause, or closely joined with "toward us."—*His* before *kindness* is altogether unnecessary.—R.]

[9] Ver. 8. [The article τῆς before πίστεως is found in ℵ. D.[3] K. L., most cursives, *Rec*; accepted by Tischendorf, Meyer, Eadie. Bracketted by Alford. It is omitted in ℵ. B. D. F. G.; rejected by Lachmann, Ellicott (not in eds. 1, 2, but in 3, 4) and Braune. The weight, though not the majority, of authorities seems to be against it.—Alford renders the last clause of the verse: *God's is the gift*, following the Greek order, but Ellicott's rendering: *the gift is God's*, better accords with the English usage respecting emphatic position.—R.]

[10] Ver. 10.—[This transposition brings out the emphasis resting on *His*, required by the Greek order, and has the additional advantage of showing that the participle *created* agrees with *we*.—The changes in the latter part of the verse are demanded by the generally admitted interpretation of the passage.—See *Exeg. Notes.*—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Connection and Summary.—After the Apostle has been led, by his petition for enlightenment respecting the glory purposed from eternity and already begun, to the carrying out of this purpose in the Church of Christ, the Body of which He is the Head, and in such a manner too, that i. 23, "so grand and solemn in matter and in manner," is adapted to form "a full-toned conclusion" (MEYER), his look is again turned to his readers to notice the "mighty working of the Father, through the resurrection and ascension of the Son, done once for all, and yet taking place in every one called into the Church" (STIER). First of all he is moved by "a glance at the similar condition of death in the case of the Gentiles (vers. 1, 2) and of the Jews (ver. 3)" (STIER) and then by the thought of God, who out of mercy has quickened and blessed the wretched in, with and through Christ (vers. 4–7): of grace through faith (vers. 8, 9), new-creating in Christ (ver. 10)!

[Braune, as will be seen below, arranges this section into paragraphs: Vers. 1–3, the condition of death out of Christ; ver. 4, the Deliverer; vers. 5, 6, the deliverance; ver. 7, the purpose; vers. 8-10, the means of bringing about the deliverance.—HODGE, who is always clear in his analysis, finds three principal topics treated of in this section:—(1) The spiritual state of the Ephesians before their conversion, vers. 1-3. (2) The change which God had wrought in them, vers. 4-6. (3) The design for which that change had been effected, vers. 7-10. He then enters into details.—ALFORD: "The power of the Father in quickening us, both Gentiles and Jews, in and with Christ (1-6); His purpose in manifesting this power (7); inference respecting the method of our salvation." This follows STIER's view, who refers the preceding clause to God.—R.]

Hence the connection of the beginning of this chapter (καὶ ὑμᾶς συνεζωποίησε, ver. 5) with "wrought" (i. 20, BENGEL) or "gave" (i. 22, HARLESS) is inadmissible. Nor is καὶ ὄντας ὑμᾶς to be joined with εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας (i. 19, KNATCHBULL and others) or with πληρουμένου (i. 23, CALOVIUS, KOPPE and others); nor is it necessary to complain here again, that a well-continued thread of discourse can scarcely be found in this Epistle (RUECKERT). Although these

grammatical connections are to be rejected, there is still an internal relation: as the petition (i. 15-19) passed over into the typical and consolatory view of the exaltation of Christ, this section by applying this to the readers in effect continues the subject.

The condition of death out of Christ (vers. 1–3). The construction is not easy at first sight, but otherwise regular: *καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας* (ver. 1)—*ὁ θεός* (ver. 4)—*συνεζωοποίησεν* (ver. 5). The expansion of the object (vers. 1-3) alone occasions the beginning of a new sentence (ver. 4), as ὁ δὲ θεός shows, indicating as do *autem, inquam* the *epanalepsis* (Winer, p. 412); in consequence the object already described (vers. 1-3) is again repeated in briefer statement (ver. 5). So Theophylact and most ancient and modern expositors. [Ellicott thus states the same view: "Ver. 1, after having its structure interrupted by the two relatival sentences, vers. 2, 3, is renewed in ver. 4 (not ver. 5, Schott) by means of δέ resumptive (Herm. *Viger*, No. 544), and there further elucidated by the interpolated nominative Θεός, expanded in application by the more comprehensive ἡμᾶς, and concluded in ver. 5."—Hodge (more popularly, but less exactly): "He dwells so long, in vers. 2-4, on the natural state of the Ephesians, that he is obliged, in ver. 5, to repeat substantially the beginning of ver. 1, in order to complete the sentence there commenced." The objection to the E. V.: *hath he quickened*, aside from the wrong tense, is that "he" has no antecedent, if ii. 23 refers to Christ, within reasonable distance.—R.]

Ver. 1. **You also**, καὶ ὑμᾶς, applies the discourse to the readers, without opposing ὑμᾶς to any others, than the genus, the whole church, as members of which they here come into special consideration, since they also have experienced, what has been experienced by the whole, and are a proof of the truth before uttered. [In rendering καὶ ὑμᾶς, "you also," it is not implied that they are contrasted with other Christians; it is chosen rather to avoid the simple connection with what precedes which is expressed by "and you," and to give prominence to the word "you;" not thus introducing "a special exemplification of the general act of grace in ver. 23," but implying a parallelism between the physical death in the case of Christ and the spiritual death in their case, as indeed the governing verb *συνεζωοποίησεν* (ver. 5) suggests.—R.]

Who were dead in your trespasses and your sins, [ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασι καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν. See *Textual Note* [1]].—Ὄντας, depending on *συνεζωοποίησε*, in view of the *ποτέ* occurring in the subsequent relative clause, is evidently=*cum eratis* (Bengel), the condition in which God found them, when He quickened them (Meyer). They were dead through sins; the dative is ablatival, marking the *causa efficiens* (Grotius, Meyer). Hence it is not equivalent to *νεκροὶ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ* (Rom. vi. 11), ye *are* dead for sin (Cajetan), nor with Grotius=*ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμασι* (Col. ii. 13, the parallel passage. in which the status, the element is emphasized).*

That Paul makes a distinction between *παράπτωμα* and *ἁμαρτία*, and what it is, is shown in Rom. v. 12-19. There the sin of Adam is termed *τὸ τοῦ ἑνὸς παράπτωμα* (vers. 15, 17, 18) or *παρακοή* (ver. 19), and through one man *ἡ ἁμαρτία* has come into the world (ver. 12). Comp. Rom. v. 20 with vii. 10-13. Παράπτωμα is applicable to the first sin of the seduced first man; the idea of *mis*deed is contained in it, of a deed not considered, *temere commissum, i. e., a nolente facere injuriam*, while *ἁμαρτία*, with its manifestations *αἱ ἁμαρτίαι* reaches further and deeper (Tittmann, *Syn.* I. p. 45 ff.).* There is here an ascent from *desertio boni* to *perpetratio mali* (Augustine). To this view approximate Harless [Hodge] (actual sins and manifestations of sin in word, deed or otherwise), Olshausen (actions of sin and the more internal sinful motions of the soul in desires and words), Jerome (*delicta cogitatione inchoata* and actual sins).† The distinction: the *mental* errors and obscurations, the *moral* sins and vices (Matthies), is unfounded; neither should we apply the former to the *Jews* and the latter to the *Gentiles* (Bengel), nor with Stier first think of the law of the State, of the conscience, well-known to the heathen also, and then of the outbreaks of corruption itself. We may not, however, take the two as purely synonymous (Koppe), or deny a *real* distinction by affirming merely a two-fold representation, fall and transgression (Meyer).—The article points to the sins committed by the readers, Rom. v. 12: *ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον*. Hence *ὑμῶν* is an unnecessary explanatory gloss. [It is to be retained on diplomatic and critical grounds, but does not affect the sense.—R.]

Under *νεκροί* we should understand the dead, made dead; it recalls *ἐκ νεκρῶν* (i. 20); Christians are no longer dead. But the natural sinful condition, according to the Scripture from Gen. ii. 17 on, is really a death, because it is without life from and in God (iv. 18). It is therefore not=miserable (Koppe and others), nor does it refer to *physical* death, as though it were equivalent to *certo morituri* (Meyer), which does not spare them now. *Spiritual* death alone is spoken of, since God is the source of life (Ps. xxxvi. 10) and without Him men are in the shadow of death (Matt. iv. 16; Luke i. 79; Matth. viii. 22; Luke xv. 24, 32; Rom. vii. 9, 10). So nearly all expositors. [No weakening of the sense is admissible; comp. *Doctr. Note* 3, d.—R.]

Ver. 2. **Wherein ye once walked** [ἐν αἷς ποτὲ περιεπατήσατε].—Ἐν αἷς, which

---

* [Eadie infers from ver. 2, "in which," that these datives represent not simply the instrument, but at the same time the condition of death. The general notion of the dative, the *where-case*, is not opposed to this. Hodge Ellicott and Alford accept the causal sense, the latter justifying the use of *in*, to express this ("sick *in* a fever"). There seems to be doubt enough as to the exact force to warrant us in retaining the preposition supplied in our version.—R.]

* [Alford doubts the universal applicability of Tittmann's distinction, but accepts it as correct here, where both words are used. In Rom. v. 12–19 (see pp. 176. 182, *Romans*) there is a very marked distinction between the words, but here it is less observable. We must however attribute to *ἁμαρτία* a more generic sense than is found in the concrete *παράπτωμα*.—R.]

† [Ellicott: The former, the more *limited* term, *viz.:* particular and special acts of sin; the latter, the more *inclusive* and abstract, embracing all forms, phases and movements of sin, whether entertained in thought or consummated in act." So Eadie, though not very decided in his preference.—R.]

connects with ἁμαρτίαις, the word just preceding and forming a climax, denotes the *causa* of the condition of death as a developed condition, as a desired element. Ποτὲ περιεπατήσατε joined with νεκρούς is an *oxymoron*, like 1 Tim. v. 6: ζῶσα τέθνηκεν. Περιπατεῖν ἐν τινι (iv. 17; v. 2; Rom. vi. 4; 2 Cor. iv. 2; Col. iii. 7) has been transferred from the Hebrew (הלך) and designates *walking* as to the mode of life (WINER, p. 32); in English it designates the being at home, having entrance and exit, having one's doings and movements, having one's residence (Matth. xvii. 22: they abode in Galilee"). [EADIE: "The ἐν marks out the sphere or walk which they usually and continually trod, for in this sleep of death there is a strange somnambulism. Col iii. 7."—R.]

According to the course of this world [κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου].—Κατά now defines a relation of those walking to a power. This relation qualifies the walk more closely as one directed thereby, dependent thereon, determined thereby; "according to," "by virtue of" are the two significations required here (STIER), which are combined in: corresponding to. This power is designated by τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, "the course of this world." This combination is peculiar, the words themselves are frequent, seeming to be used indiscriminately: 1 Cor. ii. 6 (σοφία τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου); iii. 18 (σοφὸς ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ); ver. 19 (σοφία τοῦ κόσμου τούτου); i. 20 (σοφία τοῦ κόσμου); John xii. 31 (ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου); 1 Cor. ii. 6 (τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου); 2 Cor. iv. 4 (ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου). But the distinction is clearly obvious. Αἰών (PASSOW *sub voce*, HARLESS *in loco*), from αἴω=ἄημι, ἄω, to breathe, is related to ψυχή, with which Homer joins it, referring to life and time (*ævum*); hence also ἀπ' αἰῶνος, ἀπ' αἰώνων. In the New Testament the notion of time predominates, of periods of time, and the tendencies controlling them, their character, view and mode of life, their spirit. Κόσμος is the created, but fallen, apostate world, more definitely: humanity. The former may occur in the plural, the latter not. Hence BENGEL is very correct: *Ille hunc regit, et quasi informat; κόσμος est quiddam exterius: αἰών subtilius.* "TEMPUS *dicitur non solum physice, sed etiam moraliter, connotata qualitate hominum in eo viventium; et sic αἰών dicit longam temporum seriem, ubi ætas mala malam ætatem excipit.*" Acts xiv. 16; 1 Pet. i. 18. In αἰών here the notion of the tendency of time predominates, and means more what we call the course of the world than lapse (*Verlauf*); the course includes both the time and its character, as does αἰών also. Hence: according to, corresponding to the course of this world. The αἰών is in itself ethically indefinite, hence αἰὼν πονηρός (Gal. i. 4) and the demonstrative οὗτος or a genitive as here τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. Κόσμος is the external appearance, the external continuance of the world of men, αἰών its course, current, impulse (STIER); the latter may change, vary, in different periods, the former remains, and as the latter is estranged from God, so is this.*

It is incorrect to take the two words as purely synonymous, as though it were τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον (KOPPE). We regard as arbitrary the view that they are=τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦτον τοῦ κόσμου (RUECKERT), or: τὸν κόσμον τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (BRETSCHNEIDER). It is impossible to explain this designation from the gnostic doctrine of Æons, and to understand the devil thereby (SEMLER). LUTHER's rendering: *Lauf* [so E. V.: "course"] is more apt than: spirit of the age (MATTHIES), tendency of the age (OLSHAUSEN), life (HARLESS), duration of time (MEYER), course of time (SCHENKEL).

According to the prince of the powers of the air [κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος].—Here Paul evidently passes to what stands behind the course of this world, influencing it, working through it. Κατά places this clause as parallel to the preceding, and τὸν ἄρχοντα refers to the master, the prince.* The genitive τῆς ἐξουσίας denotes the power belonging to and at the command of this prince (Matth. ix. 34; xii. 24; Mark iii. 22; Luke xi. 15). This power, which is to be considered as collective, is further defined by the genitive τοῦ ἀέρος, "of the air," most closely connected with it. Ἀήρ, which in its etymology reminds us of αἰών and in its nature of πνεῦμα, is the air, the atmosphere, surrounding the earth, breathed by all, acting upon the κόσμος, the world of men, standing in many relations to and exerting great power and influence upon their life; hence the power which the prince controls, is brought into connection with "the air," is described by "of the air," because in this are found the place and character of the power, its medium, element, region and domain, its means and mode; the figurative and literal meanings coalesce, the air as a cosmical and pneumatic reality (STIER); we too say: it lies in the air, in the time, thus denoting a quiet, profound and powerful operation. Thus Satan with his kingdom is sharply characterized, his nature spreading widely miasmata of corrupting power, from which even those truly living can scarcely withdraw or defend themselves, miasmata from diabolical choke-damp (as in the French Revolution) even to the most refined ethereal poisons of classical, æsthetic literature (vi. 11, 12; Col. i. 13). So ŒCUMENIUS has described the devil's power as ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν, οὐχ ὑπὲρ τὸν οὐρανόν, concluding thus: φύσις γὰρ τοῖς πνεύμασιν ἡ ἐναέριος διατριβή.

We reject therefore those explanations, which take ὁ ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας as *princeps potentissimus* (CLARIUS), or the genitive as appositional=ὅς ἐστιν ἐξουσία (FLATT), or *cui est potestas* (ERASMUS and others), or as the object=*imperium* (GREEK and LATIN FATHERS and others); those taking τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος as *potestatis*

* [ELLICOTT finds an ethical meaning predominant here in αἰών. "In such cases as the present the meaning seems to approach that of 'tendency, spirit, of the age' (Olsh.), yet still not without distinct trace of the regular *temporal* notion, which, even in those passages where αἰών seems to imply little more than our 'world' (comp. 2 Tim. iv. 10), may still be felt in the idea of the (evil) *course*, development, and progress ('*ubi ætas mala malam excipit*'), that is tacitly associated with the term."—R.]

* ["The world and the church are now tacitly brought into contrast as antagonistic societies; and as the church has its own exalted and glorious Head, so the world is under the control of an active and powerful master, thus characterized" (EADIE). The reference to a personality is to be found in this word, though ἐξουσίας as a collective noun includes the evil spirits whose prince is Satan.—R.]

aëriæ (*Syriac*, BUCER and others); or those taking τοῦ ἀέρος only figuratively (CALVIN, BEZA), or=τοῦ σκότους (although we find: ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἀήρ, Rev. ix. 2), either tropically *pro obnubilatione mentis* (COCCEIUS, STORR and others), or *pro concreto* as darkened spirits, men and bad angels (FLATT), or by metonyme, *continens pro contento*, the earth surrounded by the atmosphere (HILARY. BULLINGER and others), or merely as the region=ἐν τῷ ἀέρι (BAUMGARTEN, not -CRUSIUS), or only as a designation of quality=ἀέριος (A-LAPIDE, CALIXTUS and others), or referring it to the "prison," 2 Pet. ii. 4 (AUGUSTINE); nor can we suppose here a remnant of rabbinical tradition (MEYER), or echoes of a Pythagorean view of the world (MEYER, SCHENKEL), or the influence of Alexandrian gnosis (ELSNER and others). Out of such "muddy pools" or untenable speculations Paul would not have drawn his doctrine. Comp. *Doctr. Note* 3.

[HARLESS and STIER are very full on this clause. The most extended comments easily accessible to the English reader will be found in EADIE, whose opinion approaches very nearly to that of Braune. The simplest explanation is that of ALFORD, who thinks the phrase "of the air" is drawn from "the persuasion and common parlance of mankind," without conveying any teaching respecting demonology. In any case the genitive ἀέρος is to be regarded as a genitive, not of quality, but of *place*, either literal or figurative, or both, as Braune holds. HODGE, while not definitely deciding, seems to favor the untenable view, that "of the air" is="of darkness." EADIE: "The κόσμος of the New Testament is opposed to God, for it hates Christianity: the believer does not belong to it, for it is crucified to him and he to it. That same world may be an ideal sphere, comprehending all that is sinful in thought and pursuit—a region on the actual physical globe, but without geographical boundary—all that out-field which lies beyond the living church of Christ. And, like the material globe, this world of death-walkers has its own atmosphere, corresponding to it in character—an atmosphere in which it breathes and moves. All that animates it, gives it community of sentiment, contributes to sustain its life in death, and enables it to breathe and be, may be termed its atmosphere. Such an atmosphere belting a death-world, whose inhabitants are νεκροὶ τοῖς παραπτώμασι καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις, is really Satan's seat. His chosen abode is the dark nebulous zone which canopies such a region of spiritual mortality, close upon its inhabitants, ever near and ever active, unseen and yet real, unfelt and yet mighty, giving to the κόσμος that 'form and pressure'—that αἰών—which the Apostle here describes as its characteristic element." —Comp. STUART, *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1843, p. 140; HAGENBACH, *Stud. u. Krit.* I. p. 479; CUDWORTH, *Intel. System*, II. p. 664.—R.]

Of the spirit, τοῦ πνεύματος, is in apposition to τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, "of the power of the air." While the last phrase sets forth his external dominion, the parallel phrase denotes his internal efficiency. BENGEL is excellent: *principium illud internum, ex quo fluunt actiones infidelium, oppositum spiritui fidelium filiorum Dei.* It is therefore not a personality, but an influence which has become a ruling mode of thought, disposition, a πνεῦμα ἐνεργοῦν (RUECKERT, STIER). Comp. Winer, p. 589. Hence it is not to be joined in apposition to τὸν ἄρχοντα and a hypallage accepted as in iii. 2; 2 Cor. iii. 7; Luke viii. 32; xxii. 20. So CALOVIUS, KOPPE, RUECKERT; similarly FLATT. But τοῦ πνεύματος is also not dependent on τοῦ ἀέρος, as HOFMANN (*Schriftbeweis* I. p. 455) thinks, taking ἐξουσία in accordance with Luke xxiii. 7 as the region of dominion, so that the air of the spirit working in the disobedient is the atmosphere formed by his nature. Nor is it to be taken collectively, just as ἐξουσία τοῦ ἀέρος is the complex of demons (GROTIUS and others). It is the spirit, which through its ruler, the devil, exists outside of individuals, defines them, works in them, the *spirit of the age* [*Zeitgeist*].

[The apposition with ἐξουσίας is at all events to be accepted, with the majority of modern commentators. But here the two views present themselves: (1) the reference to the evil principle, which must be taken objectively as the article requires (MEYER, ELLICOTT), as Braune holds, or (2) to the aggregate character of the individual πνεύματα (EADIE, ALFORD). The former is open to the objection, that it represents Satan as the prince of a principle, and the latter assumes a collective sense which is quite unusual. If we accept a tacit antithesis to the Spirit of God, and remember that this spirit is here conceived of as distinct from its influence on men, (1) will be the safer view —R.]

Which now worketh, τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος.—This spirit is to be regarded as efficient, not as effected, *affectus mundanus* (SCHMIDT); νῦν being put in advance and "in the children of disobedience" appended for emphasis. "Now" expresses the fact that it has not ceased to work, after no longer working in them, the readers (ποτέ); it now works in the children of disobedience, subjects of its activity are not wanting; it might be explained with OLSHAUSEN by ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ. From this danger always springs for the believers. Hence it is not: now still, *ad huc* (MEYER and others), nor: *nunc maxime* (BENGEL: *qui evangelium per incredulitatem spernunt, manent mancipia spiritus illius et amplius capiuntur;* STIER: "more now, since accomplished redemption proffers itself"). RUECKERT also, with FLATT, refers to the extraordinary, specially dangerous power of the Satanic kingdom in the age of Redemption (2 Thess. ii. 2 ff.; 2 Cor. iv. 4). [So DE WETTE].

In the sons of disobedience, ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας.—Thus are those designated who are οἱ ἐξ ἀπειθείας (comp. Rom. ii. 8: οἱ ἐξ ἐριθείας), who are dependent on, springing from, nourished by disobedience, as v. 6; Col. iii. 6. It is a Hebraistic expression. [It marks "the essential and innate disobedience of the subjects, a disobedience to which they belong as children to a parent" (ELLICOTT).—R.] "Disobedience" emphasizes the immoral nature of unbelief, which is precisely disobedience, contumacy, among the heathen also, who resist the secret voice of God in their conscience (Rom. ii. 14, 15) as well as among the Jews who resist the revealed will of God in the word of the prophets, and among both, in resisting the apostolic an-

nounoement. MEYER should not be willing to refute the explanation: unbelief (LUTHER, BENGEL, HARLESS, STIER).*—The preposition ἐν, "in," marks the internality of this Satanic working: in their souls (MEYER). They are the "fulness" of the devil, on whose part there is a "spirit," efficient unto destruction, which the disobedient and unbelieving mood already present in man comes to meet.

Ver. 3. **Among whom even we all had our way of life in times past** [ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἀνεστράφημέν ποτε].—The emphasis rests on καὶ ἡμεῖς "even we;" in antithesis to "you" (ver. 1), the readers, whom he describes as previously heathen, he places himself and the Jewish Christians,† and that too without exception ("all"). Ἐν οἷς, according to grammatical rules, refers to "the children of disobedience" (ver. 2); thus declaring that those who were formerly Jews belonged also to the children of disobedience; ἐν οἷς is=ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς ὄντες, in order to lay down the ethical category for the Jews (MEYER). So the same corruption and its universality are predicated of the Jews, over against the Gentiles. Comp. *Doctr. Note* 3. We should not then render it *inter quos*, or explain that although the Jews were actually locally among the Gentiles, they did not live there as children of disobedience. The reference to παραπτώμασιν, "trespasses," ver. 1 (*Syriac*, JEROME, BENGEL, STIER and others), is at once impossible, if ὑμῶν be retained there, and in any case inadmissible on account of "in the lusts of our flesh," which denotes the element or sphere of the verb, so that this cannot be found in ἐν οἷς. The grammatical connection cannot be decided by the parallel passage, Col. iii. 7: ἐν οἷς—περιεπατήσατε, since parallelism will not contravene the requirements of grammar.

In the lusts of our flesh [ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν].—The repetition of ἐν in the same clause occurs also in 2 Cor. i. 12: ἐν ἁγιότητι καὶ εἰλικρινείᾳ—ἐν σοφίᾳ—ἐν χάριτι ἀνεστράφημεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, where the first phrase answers to the last in our verse, and the last to our first. BENGEL remarks on the verb: *hoc quiddam speciosius quam ambulare*. STIER finds it sharper and stronger than περιεπατήσατε, used of the Gentiles. LUTHER: "ye have walked"—"we have had our walk." [So substantially the E. V.] This ἀναστρέφεσθαι refers more to an unquiet, refractory, quarrelsome course of conduct, περιπατεῖν is rather an indolent letting one's self go according to habit. The qualifying phrase; "in the lusts of our flesh," also sharpens the affirmative here, in comparison with that respecting the Gentiles. Among the latter the power of the evil spirit works, as respects the Jews prominence is given to their own disposition and will. Israel had already the proper ἀρχων in the theocracy, in its discipline another ἐξουσία, the moderating and helping air of a better spirit, being by no means given over in the same degree to the course of this world (STIER).—HARLESS sets forth very well the order of the significations of σάρξ; 1) what is *material*, 2) *external*, not mental, 3) what is *ruled by matter*, and in so far *sinful*, 4) what is *sinful*, opposed directly to the Spirit of God, 5) *Humanity* in all these aspects. [Comp. the Excursus in *Romans*, pp. 235 ff. The word is here used in its ethical sense: the *whole human nature* turned away from God, in the supreme interest of self, devoted to the creature.—R.]

Doing the wishes of the flesh and of the thoughts [ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν].—Ποιοῦντες, placed first for emphasis, defines more closely the preceding verb. [A participle of manner.—R.] The children of disobedience to whom they belonged, do the wills, τὰ θελήματα,* not merely single ones, which the flesh has, and those τῶν διανοιῶν, as real servants, slaves in fact. The plural denotes the confused, opposing multiplicity; a united, self-contained will is not spoken of. But these are not mere ebullitions of the flesh. "The διανοεῖσθαι is the internal self-activity of man, conscious of his nature as self-determinable, and the διάνοιαι are the manifold productions of this" (HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, I. p. 563). He appears as the slave of his inborn nature and of his selfish thought; the two are turned to various objects, and in his desires create a diversity. The understanding or the reason stands in the service of the flesh, falls into subtleties, seeking reasons, excuses, ways and means for the "lusts of the flesh," helping the desire to strengthen into determinations and activities of the will. Διάνοιαι are "opinions of the will representing themselves as prudent, deceitful grounds of volition." COGITATIONES *callidius peccandi studium inferunt*, CARO *cœco ruit impetu* (BENGEL). The plural marks the sundering, the confusion of the διάνοια into the unhappy and treacherous diversity (HARLESS, STIER); the flesh makes a heap of reasonings (*Berlenburger Bible*). The context determines this view, as MEYER correctly remarks, but the form chosen subserves the context, corresponding well to its purpose; but it should be noted, that διάνοιαι is used by Paul only here, and θελήματα only in his speech, Acts xiii. 22, there too of God's will. It is incorrect to regard διάνοιαι as loose fancies (MATTHIES),

* [The connection between "unbelief" and "disobedience" is undoubted, but the former does not come into any special prominence here. The word here "characterizes the world not as in direct antagonism to the gospel, but as it is by nature—hostile to the will and government of God, and daringly and wantonly violating that law which is written in their hearts" (EADIE).—R.]

† [The reference to Jewish Christians has been accepted by the vast majority of commentators, both on account of the particular antithesis (ὑμᾶς, ver. 1) and the general distinction which seems to attach to these pronouns in this Epistle. But DE WETTE, EADIE, ELLICOTT, ALFORD oppose this reference here, on the ground that πάντες will not admit of this limitation. In every case Paul refers to both, when he uses ἡμεῖς πάντες.—Perhaps it is safest to follow this usage here, for the doctrinal teaching remains the same, whether we suppose the Apostle is emphasizing the fact that all Christians are children of wrath by nature, or even the Jews who thought themselves children of promise by nature.—The meaning of οἱ λοιποί at the close of the verse will of course be modified by the view taken of ἡμεῖς.—R.]

* [ELLICOTT says of this word: "It here probably denotes the various exhibitions and manifestations of the will, and is thus symmetrical with, but a fuller expansion of ἐπιθυμίαις." So MEYER. EADIE similarly; the latter inclinations, the former the resolves into which they ripen, and which are further divided.—The use of the word seemed to justify our finding in it an element of desire, though the E. V. is too decided in its rendering.—R.]

sensuous thoughts without the basis of sensuous desire (OLSHAUSEN), or corrupt imaginations (HASE).

[The distinction between the two classes of θελήματα is thus expressed by EADIE: "The 'desires of the flesh' are those grosser gratifications of appetite which are palpable and easily recognized; and the 'desires of the thoughts,' those mental trespasses which may or may not be connected with sensuous indulgences." ELLICOTT: "The worldly sensual tendency of our life on the one hand, and the spiritual sins of our thoughts and intentions on the other." Both EADIE and HODGE restrict σάρξ (in the second clause, not in the first) to the animal part of our nature, but this scarcely seems justifiable, especially as the wider meaning gives so good a sense. Nor is the latter exact in taking διανοία as including "the whole thinking and sentient principle, so far as distinguished from the animal principle," still less in referring it here "more to the affections." MEYER says διάνοιαι bears to σάρξ in this case the relation of the special to the general.—The article before σαρκός and before διανοιῶν would justify the rendering "our flesh," "our thoughts," but the literal translation is sufficiently explicit, "thoughts" being the nearest equivalent to διάνοια.—R.]

And we were by nature the children of wrath [καὶ ἦμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς].—Καὶ ἦμεν is most naturally taken as i. 19-22: ἐγείρας—καὶ καθίσας—καὶ ὑπέταξεν, or ἐγείρας—καὶ ἐκάθισεν—and joined with ποιοῦντες, as a participle resolved into the finite verb. Since ἦμεν comes first, it is emphatic. [The change of construction gives emphasis to this verb also, marking that they "were," not that they "are," and further, as EADIE suggests, indicating unmistakably, that what they "were by nature" was not the result of what they had been doing.—The insertion of "we" in the English text will serve to indicate this emphasis.—R.] The Apostle has noted the *action* in the preceding clause, he now notices the *state* of the Jews, which is perceptible and perceived from the action, and hence put in the second place, this like the other being more sharply expressed than in the case of the heathen. This is parallel to "the children of disobedience," among whom he has already reckoned them (ἐν οἷς) but among whom they are now characterized as "by nature children of wrath." The phrases: "son of perdition" (2 Thess. ii. 3), "child of hell" (Matth. xxiii. 15), "Son of peace" (Luke x. 6) are similar. Paul says τέκνα, not υἱοί, not to weaken it into "little children," but to indicate the relation to birth.

The genitive ὀργῆς without the article must be connected as closely as possible with τέκνα, "children of wrath." [Not mere liable to wrath, but under it, as the figure implies.—R.] The Hebrew phrase בְּנֵים־לַיהוָה (2 Sam. xii. 5: υἱὸς θανάτου in the LXX., comp. Ps. lxxix. 11; cii. 21) may have occasioned the expression, but does not modify the explanation in the N. Testament, nor justify a weakening of the meaning, only marking the dependence of ὀργή, which the context (ver. 4) defines as that of God. So v. 6; Col. iii. 6; Rom. i. 18; comp. *Doctr. Note* 1

Φύσει is not so emphatic as ἦμεν, nor even as τέκνα, denoting only a closer qualification of the latter, as regards origin, by nature. Φύσις (from φύω, to become, to arise, as *natura* from *nasci*, *ingenium* from *geno*, *gigno*) refers to birth, origin, and is that which has grown as distinguished from what has been effected, has the ground of its being, as it is in its own development, not in the accessory influence of others (HARLESS, STIER). [So EADIE, ALFORD, HODGE, ELLICOTT and the vast body of commentators. The last named finds the exact meaning in Gal. ii. 25; Rom. ii. 14; Gal. iv. 8, to be respectively (*a*) transmitted inborn nature; (*b*) inherent nature; (*c*) essential nature. The first is the meaning here, see below.—R.] So in Gal. iv. 8; Rom. ii. 24 (comp. Acts xvii. 28) φύσει points to the ground and origin of the present status. The meaning of these words necessarily is: we were from birth those who were forfeited to the Divine wrath, *iræ Dei devoti atque obnoxii, quasi ad eam rem ab ipsa natura effecti* (BEZA). Indeed ἡ φύσις is something living, developing itself, but from its beginning, in accordance with the principle inherent in it, so that there is included here also the natural development, further determined by man in his unregenerate state.

Standing in contrast to this φύσει is the Divine θέσις of God's work of revelation and of His covenant with the people of Israel, according to which they should not be "children of wrath," and also might not have been. "As belonging to the people of God, the Jews were בָּנִים־לַיהוָה, but aside from this, consequently as belonging to the Adamite humanity, they were τέκνα ὀργῆς" (HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, I. p. 565), hence φύσει. It is aptly mentioned that CHEMNITZ remarks: *Dicit, eramus et nos, Judæi scilicet. Dixerat enim Rom.* xi. 16: *si radix sancti, ergo rami. Ne ergo intelligatur, Judæos natura esse sanctos, dicit; eramus et nos Judæi filii iræ, sicut cœteri* (HARLESS). The position of φύσει between τέκνα and ὀργῆς suggests too: we were children—that is, φύσει, not θέσει, ὀργῆς, and yet might and should have been διαθήκης (*cum putaremus nos esse liberos liberos Dei.* BENGEL)! [The doctrine of original sin is here plainly implied (EADIE, HODGE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, and others), the implication being an "even more convincing assertion of that profound truth." The opposition of BARNES and STUART, so far as it has an exegetical basis, finds some justification in the forcing of a direct theological statement on our passage. But the attitude here taken as respects this fearful fact of a *universal natural state of condemnation*, is precisely that which the Scriptures hold toward the question of the existence of God: it is not proved, but assumed. Comp. *Doctr. Notes* 1, 3, 4; EADIE *in loco; Romans*, Dr. SCHAFF's exhaustive notes on v. 12-21, especially pp. 178–180, 191–195; the last reference is to a *resumè* of the theories of original sin.—R.]

Accordingly "children of wrath" is not to be taken as merely a Hebraizing phrase for "worthy of wrath," *ira rei, digni* (THEODORET, RUECKERT and others), nor *proprii iræ* (STRIEGEL), objects of wrath (FLACIUS). Nor is ὀργή=*pœna* (GREEK FATHERS). Quite as little is φύσει=ἀληθῶς, γνησίως (ŒCUMENIUS), or: *natura, indole gentis* (CLER-

ICUS), still less: *paternæ traditionis consuetudine* (PELAGIUS), since it is the very opposite of συνήθεια. Moreover we should not think of a relation produced by the development of a *nativa indoles* (MEYER), or of the customary actual life of sin, "a doing of the wills of the flesh and of the thoughts," which had become habitual, making them "the children of wrath" (SCHENKEL). BLEEK says more circumspectly: the reference here is *not merely* to the inborn character, but also to the natural development springing from the man himself. To explain it of the natural condition of man in ante-christian life (ERASMUS and others) leaves undecided the main question, whether or not the φύσει designates an inborn relation. HOLZHAUSEN's connection of φύσει with ὀργῆς (wrath springing from the ungodly natural life) is entirely too inverted.

Even as others, ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποί.—In 1 Thess. iv. 13, this designates the Gentiles, who have not become Christians. Λοιποί are passed over, without any further characteristics; according to the context the word classes together here men with and men without Christ, who have not submitted themselves to the working of Christ, resist it; such can be among Christians even. We may easily suppose, however, that Paul means the yet unbelieving Jews, over against the "we all," who have become believers in Christ; this would render prominent that while the Jewish Christians who have been rescued from the condition of death are no longer "children of wrath," these are and remain so, like the heathen, the "children of disobedience." So STIER, while nearly all expositors refer it either to the Gentiles (MEYER and others) or to all except those mentioned before (HARLESS and others); the latter is unquestionably more correct than the former, since just here the Gentiles are not in question, and to refer it to these alone, would be as if ver. 3 had been appended. The extension to other nations is, however, unnecessary, since all men are either Jews or Gentiles, and what has been said of the previous life of Christians from among the Gentiles or Jews, applies to the whole of the human race. It marks in a tender, sparing manner those Jews unconverted to Christ as "children of wrath," as the Gentiles not converted to Christ are "children of disobedience," in whom Satan works. [Those who refer ἡμεῖς πάντες to *all Christians*, of course take οἱ λοιποί as including all the rest of mankind, *not Christians;* but the universality of sin and guilt remains the indirect (and more convincing) assertion of the passage, whatever reference be adopted.—R.]

Ver. 4. *The Deliverer.* **But God**, ὁ δὲ θεός.—This is not antithetical, but resumes the discourse, begun with the object and then lengthened out, in order to permit the subject to follow, as we would say in German: *hat also Gott.* [We have no word so strictly resumptive as the German *also*, or the Greek δέ, as used here, hence the E. V. supplies both subject and verb in ver. 1, and resumes here with "but," which may bear a resumptive meaning.—R.] See on ver. 1. The δέ is required here by the antithesis in which the subject stands to the object; otherwise we have found σύν here (MEYER and others). [HODGE makes the antithesis too strong: "notwithstanding our guilt and misery."—R.]

Being rich in mercy [πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει].—Πλούσιος stands first for emphasis; our Epistle frequently mentions the riches in God (i. 7; Rom. x. 12: πλουτῶν). [Ὢν does not seem to be causal here (HODGE: "because He is rich in mercy"), but rather to state (in the form of a secondary predicate of time) the general principle under which the Divine compassion was exhibited (ELLICOTT, ALFORD); "being rich in mercy." The special ground follows.—R.] The connection "rich in mercy" is like Jas. ii. 5 ("rich in faith"); 1 Cor. i. 5; 2 Cor. ix. 11. So πλῆθος τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σου, Ps. li. 1; lxix. 16. But ἔλεος is somewhat more than οἰκτιρμός (*ὁ ἐλεῶν subvenire studet misero et si potest, vere subvenit, sed qui intra fines doloris se tenet, is tantum οἰκτείρει*; TITTMANN, *Syn.* I. p. 70).

Because of his great love wherewith he loved us [διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ ἣν ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς].—The preposition (διά) marks the ground of His doings (vers. 5, 6), on account of this, *propter multum suum amorem.* LUTHER is therefore incorrect: *through* His *great* love. Prominence is given, not so much to the greatness, as to the riches, the manifold character of the love of God. The construction, ἣν ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, is like John xvii. 26; Mark x. 38. WINER, p. 210.—The great love of God (αὐτοῦ) is added by Paul, after the expression respecting the riches of His mercy, which he had placed first on account of the context over against the condition of death in the case of Gentiles and Jews alike, because there was to be found in men themselves no ground at all for their salvation. Mercy was in God the movement of His love, which belongs to His Being; that men should be helped, required the entire *fulness* of the love of God. MISERICORDIA *removet miseriam*, AMOR *confert salutem* (BENGEL). CALVIN incorrectly joins διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην with πλούσιος ὤν [HODGE apparently]; the latter is an attribute of God, the former is an adverbial qualification of συνεζωοποίησεν. "Us" must be applied here to entire Christendom, after the necessary statements about "you" (vers. 1, 2) and "us" (ver. 3). *Aperta satis hæc verba sunt et cognitu facillima, si tantum et creditu facilia ea plerisque dominus redderet* (BUCER)! STIER refers it to the Jews, on which view see next verse. [It is=ἡμεῖς πάντες, if that phrase be accepted in its wider reference.—R.]

The Deliverance; vers. 5, 6.

Ver. 5. **Even when we were dead in our trespasses** [καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν].—After ἡμᾶς (ver. 4) the object is again repeated, with a reference to what has been said in vers. 1-3, in admiration and wonder at the Divine grace, mercy and love. Now however we read καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς, while before we had καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας (ver. 1), καὶ ἡμεῖς (ver. 3); the emphasis therefore rests on ὄντας, and καί puts this state of death with another ὤν in a certain relation to πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει. Accordingly the distinction between those dead, between "you" and "us" falls into the background behind the existence, the reality of this condition.

[Against MEYER, who takes *καί* as the simple copula, and RUECKERT, who deems it resumptive, we are fully justified in taking it as *intensive*, retaining *even* (E. V.) therefore; so ALFORD, ELLICOTT and most.—The dative is precisely as in ver. 1.—R.] What he has said in ver. 1 of the heathen: "dead in trespasses," is true of both therefore: it is the briefest expression, and quite sufficient after the previous explication of the object, especially as he mentions *παραπτώματα*, in which the reality of the condition of death is perceptible. The article denotes that the sins are the sins of the "dead" themselves (MEYER). [Hence *our* trespasses.]

This statement cannot indeed be referred to entire humanity; though it be done *for* all men, yet it is only done *in* Christians; and that is what is spoken of here. But it is just as little to be limited to Jewish Christians (STIER); the interchange of *ἡμεῖς* and *ὑμεῖς* (vers. 5, 7, 8) springs from the liveliness of the discourse, the interest in the readers and the purpose of the Apostle. *Καί* is of course not=*καίπερ*, *quamvis* (CALVIN, SCHENKEL). [For a making alive could only be from a state of death, not in spite of it.—R.]

Quickened us together with Christ, *συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ*.—The construction is clear; the dative is governed by the *σύν* in composition. A fact in the past is clearly denoted as having taken place upon Christ and upon us. The meaning is also indicated by the antithesis or object: the dead He has made alive; were these not physically, but spiritually dead, then a spiritual life is meant. The preposition *σύν* does not denote contemporaneousness, but only fellowship: in the fellowship with the Risen One God quickened us also: Him hath He raised from the dead, us from our death, but not without Him, the Risen One. The verb itself does not determine any thing more definite regarding the life; the tense marks only the act of God as having taken place. Nothing further is added. Accordingly this fact is to be taken altogether objectively, without a subjective reference, altogether generally, without further qualification, as Col. ii. 12, 13, 20; iii. 1, 3; Rom. vi. 4-6; it is simply: He quickened us together with Christ. THEODORET: *κεφαλὴ ἡμῶν ὁ συνεδρεύων, ἀπαρχὴ ἡμῶν ὁ συμβασιλεύων· τὴν γὰρ ἡμετέραν ἐνδέδυται φύσιν.* Comp. i. 7, 22, 23. Though the life of Christ the Risen One is completed, and ours just begun, beginning in the Spirit, yet the two stand in an internal connection (2 Cor. v. 15), the latter, like the former, is the Father's act, in which the whole, the full life is implied and granted.

Accordingly it is first of all incorrect to apply *συν* to the re-animation of the Jews and Gentiles *together* (BEZA), or: *sicut ad exemplum* (ANSELM, GROTIUS). Then the reference is not to physical death and the actual resurrection life (MEYER), or to the forgiveness of sins (RUECKERT), or only to the first degree of life, from which the subsequent ones advance (OLSHAUSEN), or to justification and regeneration (BODEUS); nor are the aorists to be justified by recalling God's prescience (JEROME), or by introduced hope (AUGUSTINE, ERASMUS), or by a prophetic view, as if it had already taken place, were as good as certain (MEYER), nor is the fact of the actual accomplishment of this act of love in the readers, the Christians to be set aside by an emphasizing of the objective act in Christ (HARLESS).*

By grace ye have been saved [*χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι*].—In lively discourse, with a direct application to the readers, this is joined parenthetically to the general, objective fact of new life in Christ. The emphasis rests on *χάριτι*, which comes first; it refers to "His great love," is God's grace, thus dismissing all thought of claim and merit on the part of man. The clause emphasizes the fact of the deliverance from death into life, from wrath into love. Ye are (*ἐστε*)! This means more than the simple *ἐσώθετε*. ["Ye have been and are saved," the perfect of permanent state, implying that God's grace abides.—R.] *Videmus, ut nunquam sibi in prædicanda gratiæ amplitudine satisfaciat; ideoque identidem pluribus verbis inculcat, nihil esse in salute nostra, quod non sit Deo tribuendum certe qui ingratitudinem hominum rite expendet, non fastidiet hanc parenthesin quasi supervacaneam* (CALVIN).† It is not interpolated from what follows (GROTIUS), nor is the grace of Christ (BEZA) referred to.

Ver. 6. **And raised us up with him and made us sit with him in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus** [*καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*].—After thus specializing, Paul expands what was expressed in *συνεζωοποίησεν*. Here the first verb gives prominence to the negative side, and the second, with "in heavenly places," to the positive side of the quickening; the former marks the disappearance of the condition of death, the latter the permanent participation in what is heavenly. The liveliness of the discourse causes the introduction and repetition of *καί*, *καί*; they are not to be rendered: both—and. "In heavenly places" (comp. on i. 3) sets forth the antithesis to "the power of the air;" "at His right hand" (i. 20) could be predicated only of Christ (BENGEL:

* [EADIE emphasizes the subjective side: "The object of the Apostle, however, is not merely to affirm that spiritual life and resurrection have been secured by such a connection with Jesus, but that having been so provided, they are really possessed." This makes the "life" here referred to strictly spiritual. But a reference to physical resurrection seems to be involved (ALFORD, ELLICOTT). The aorist, retaining its proper force, has occasioned some difficulty. While the reading *ἐν* (B.) is to be rejected, and "in Christ" is not the exact sense, we must still hold that this thought underlies our verse. "What God wrought in Christ He wrought *ipso facto* in all who are united with Him" (ELLICOTT); not to the exclusion of a reference to the actual quickening in the case of believers. "When He was raised physically, all His people were *ideally* raised in Him; and in consequence of this connection with Him, they are, through faith, actually quickened and raised" (EADIE).—Dr. HODGE finds in the last fact that two other aorists follow a reason for limiting this verb to the beginning of the work of restoration, and yet says, ver. 6: "In its widest sense the life, which in ver. 5 is said to be given to us, includes the exaltation expressed in this verse. It is, therefore, only by way of amplification that the Apostle, after saying we are made partakers of the life of Christ, adds that we are raised up and enthroned with Him in heaven." If the latter position be correct, the verb is not to be limited here.—R.]

† [ELLICOTT: "This emphatic mention of grace (grace, not works) is to make the readers feel what their own hearts might otherwise have caused them to doubt,—the real and vital truth, that they have present, and actual fellowship with Christ in the quickening, yea, and even in the resurrectionary and glorifying power of God."—R.]

Christo sua manet excellentia), but "in heavenly places" of Christians also. "In Christ Jesus," following "with Christ" (ver. 5), introduces the mediation in the fellowship with Him; with this Col. ii. 12, 13 should be compared. [EADIE takes "in Christ Jesus" as qualifying "in the heavenly places," but this is scarcely allowable. —R.]

Accordingly, "raised with him," is not an advance from "quickened" toward "made us sit" (OLSHAUSEN) [EADIE], the first two expressions occur Col. ii. 12, 13 in inverted order. We should not interpolate *spe* (GROTIUS) or *jure et virtute spirituali* (BENGEL), nor are the aorists to be taken as futures from a prophetic view (A-LAPIDE), nor should we refer them to *summa et universa felicitas* (KOPPE), or to something spiritual, which is not yet objectively and really given. Comp. Col. iii. 1-3; Phil. iii. 20; Rom. vi. 6-10. Though ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is not=*per et propter Christum*, yet it cannot be denied that fellowship with Him is indicated (HARLESS), in accordance with the συν in the verbs.* But it may not be affirmed that on account of this "wonderful union" of the redeemed with the Redeemer, all the occurrences, through which the Redeemer passed after His death until His glorification, are spiritually and morally, hence in this life, consummated in the converted (SCHENKEL). Comp. *Doctr. Note* 2.

[EADIE also takes the three aorists as referring to what takes place in this life, and as marking successive steps: "The dead, on being quickened, do not lie in their graves." ELLICOTT is very cautious here: "As συνεζωοποίησεν, though primarily spiritual and present, may have a physical and future reference,—so here conversely, a present spiritual resurrection and enthronement may also be attended to," the primary reference being, as he thinks, to what is future and objective. ALFORD seems most correct: "God vivified us together with Christ: in the one act and fact of His resurrection He raised all His people—to spiritual life, and in that to victory over death, both spiritual and *therefore necessarily* physical also. To dispute therefore whether such an expression as this is past (spiritual), or future (physical), is to forget that the whole includes its parts.—The three aorists are proleptical as regards the actualization in each man, but equally describe a past and accomplished act on God's part.—The disputes as to whether these are to be taken as present or future, actual or potential, literal or spiritual, will be easily disposed of by those who have apprehended the truth of the believer's union in and with Christ." This last statement finds a striking confirmation in the fact, that many a commentator begins by limiting the sense, and ends by including the entire meaning.—R.]

Ver. 7. *The purpose.*—**That he might show forth,** ἵνα ἐνδείξηται.—The verb stands emphatically first. Ἐνδείκνυσθαι (Rom. ii. 15; ix. 17, 22; 1 Tim. i. 16; 2 Tim. iv. 14; Tit. ii. 10; iii. 2) has, like ἔνδειξις (2 Cor. viii. 24) the signification of an efficient, active showing, a making known through communicating, giving, causing to experience. It is not a mere φανεροῦν, γνωρίζειν, *declarare* (OLSHAUSEN, MEYER and others. [EADIE inclines to the singular meaning: give a specimen of, which is not in accordance with the emphasis resting on the word. —R.]

In the ages which are to come, ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσι τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις.—The plural marks a series, the word αἰῶνες, periods of time, stretching over "generations" (iii. 21), standing over against "the course (αἰών) of this world (ver. 2), not mere καιροί, occasions, moments of time (i. 10); ἐπερχόμενοι points to coming periods, *i. e.*, according to the context, those periods (*temporibus instantibus*) following each other with the fact of Redemption in the resurrection of Christ as the starting-point; lastly the preposition ἐν marks these as the spaces of time in which the showing takes place, in which there is really an advance. BENGEL: *Plurale, contra unum seculum malum, cui secula beata superveniunt potenter. Congruit hæc locutio menti Pauli de die novissimo non proxime instante.* Even in the earliest Epistles there is not wanting the thought of the long development of Christianity, whose blossoming in the Apostolic Church and in the first Christians as first fruits and representatives, lets us perceive the fulness of their Lord (1 Thess. iv. 15-17; comp. v. 1: 2 Thess. i. 7; comp. ii. 3 ff.). It is neither the age succeeding the resurrection, the age of the *parousia* (GROTIUS, MEYER), nor αἰὼν μέλλων (HARLESS). [These limitations are rejected by EADIE, ALFORD and ELLICOTT, HODGE who agree with Braune in referring the phrase to the successive periods of time between the resurrection and the Second Advent of Christ. The plural forbids the limitation to any one age, the present participle renders any remote future reference improbable. The Second Advent is rarely alluded to in this Epistle (ALFORD), though as usual MEYER finds it here also.—R.]

The exceeding riches of his grace, τὸ ὑπερβάλλον πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ.—The neuter form τὸ πλοῦτος is well established here, as in iii. 16, and occurs several times (iii. 8; Phil. iv. 19; Col. ii. 2). On ὑπερβάλλον, see notes on i. 19. It denotes, over against the wrath of God (ver. 3) and the power of Satan (ver. 2) the triumphant superior power, hence it is not=περισσεύειν (i. 8). Comp. Rom. v. 20. Evidently as in the case of those realities, so is the power of this grace efficient, already imparted. Rom. ix. 23.

In kindness toward us in Christ Jesus [ἐν χρηστότητι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ].—"In kindness" designates the mode of showing the grace, "the friendly, condescending kindness" (HEUBNER), which expressed itself in Christ's Incarnation and in Himself. TITTMANN (*Syn.* I. p. 195): *Est benignitas Dei ad benefaciendum hominibus potius parata, quam ad puniendum; differt a voce χάρις; in hac enim certe in N. T. imperat notio benevolentiæ et gratiæ, quæ nihil merentibus bene facit.* It is therefore not here (as TITTMANN thinks, p. 142): *ipsum beneficium in nos Dei benignitate per Jesum Christum;* it is not χάρισμα, but χάρις is active "in kindness," the condescending love scatters out of the fulness of its

* [The force of συν in the two verbs is brought out in our rendering of this verse. A neater version would probably be: "And with Him raised us up, and made us sit in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus."—R.]

possessions; that is, its "kindness." [EADIE says of the four terms here used respecting the source of salvation: ἔλεος, ἀγάπη, χάρις, χρηστότης, "the first respects our misery; the second defines the co-essential form of this—ἔλεος; the third characterizes its free outgoing, and the last points to its palpable and experienced embodiment." He finds an evident alteration in χάρις, χρηστότης, Χριστός.—R.]

'Εφ' ἡμᾶς is connected with "in kindness," as χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (Rom. xiv. 17) and similar cases. See WINER, p. 126. This occurs with anarthrous substantives, which receive further definition; ἐπὶ denotes the object of the kindness, as Luke vi. 35. The phrase: ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ without τοὺς or ὄντας is therefore not to be referred to ἡμᾶς. Were it grammatically admissible, the thought would not be against it, since it corresponds with "to us-ward who believe" (i. 19). As, however, it stands here without any word to connect it with ἡμᾶς, it must be taken as qualifying the verb ἐνδείξηται.* *Notanda repetitio nominis Christi, quia nihil gratiæ neque amoris a Deo sperari vult, nisi ipso intercedente* (CALVIN). Comp. *Doctr. Note* 2.

The means of the deliverance. Vers. 8-10.

Ver. 8. **For by grace have ye been saved through faith**, τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ πίστεως.—This is a completed, more closely defined, repetition of the parenthetical clause (ver. 5). Γάρ is connective. *Non* IGITUR *ait, sed* ENIM, *quia ab effectu ad causam concludit* (BENGEL): because He in the course of time brings into manifestation nothing else than the exceeding riches of His grace. Ye are saved by grace. Τῇ χάριτι, not merely χάριτι (ver. 5), to denote the category; the article referring to the grace mentioned in ver. 7, the wealth of which is so exceeding, marking thus the grace in question (MEYER). The dative expresses, as Rom. iii. 24 (αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως), the motive, διά with the genitive here states the subjective means,† in the passage just referred to, the objective. Comp. WINER, p. 204 f. The emphasis rests on "by grace," which is placed first, being the *causa efficiens;* the *causa apprehendens* follows, as a modal qualification. On the nature of "faith," see *Doctr. Note* 5.

And that not of yourselves: the gift is God's [καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον].—"And that" refers back to the idea of the preceding verb: "ye are saved," in the sense of *et quidem* (PASSOW, sub οὗτος, 12); and *this in addition* I say, or *and this*, being saved through faith, comes not out of yourselves. Thus the value of διὰ πίστεως is put below that of τῇ χάριτι; salvation has not its origin in faith or the believing one (οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν); he has indeed only to accept it. Hence there is at once added to the negative the positive (not parenthetical, HARLESS) expression: θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον, God's is the gift, *i. e.*, the salvation; the genitive being=ἐκ θεοῦ (Phil. iii. 9) or ἀπὸ θεοῦ (Phil. i. 29), and τὸ δῶρον=δωρεάν (Rom. iii. 24; v. 15, 17), *gratis*, as a present of grace.

[The reference to salvation is adopted by CALVIN, RUECKERT, HARLESS, OLSHAUSEN, MEYER, DE WETTE, STIER, EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, and every commentator of note since the days of BENGEL, except HODGE.* Of course on doctrinal grounds there is no objection to the reference to faith, for, as ELLICOTT remarks, "it may be said that the clause καὶ τοῦτο κ. τ. λ. was *suggested* by the mention of the subjective medium πίστις, which might be thought to imply some independent action on the part of the subject." But since the next verse: "not of works," cannot be referred to faith, and an unnecessary parenthesis, creating some confusion and destroying the obvious parallelism between ἐξ ὑμῶν and ἐξ ἔργων, is the result of this view, it seems far better to accept the other reference. The gender of τοῦτο is not decisive in favor of this; but when it stands so near to πίστεως, it does seem strange that it should not be feminine, were the latter its antecedent.—R.]

Ver. 9 takes up the negative side again: **not of works**, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, used by Paul repeatedly (Rom. iii. 20; iv. 2; xi. 6; Gal. ii. 16; iii. 2; v. 4; Tit. iii. 5). Without the article, because in this respect there are no saving, meritorious works; it is God who rescues, and He is determined thereto by no works or virtues of men. There is not here, nor should there be, any thought of the works of the Mosaic law (BLEEK). Thus the phrase "not of yourselves" is more closely and sharply defined. Accordingly we should not accept a parenthesis from καὶ τοῦτο to ἐξ ἔργων (GRIESBACH) or καὶ τοῦτο—τὸ δῶρον (BEZA), or θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον (LACHMANN, HARLESS), nor refer καὶ τοῦτο to διὰ τῆς πίστεως and then to infer τὸ πιστεύειν on this account (FATHERS, ERASMUS and others).

That no man should boast, ἵνα μή τις καυχήσηται.—This is the manifest end (ἵνα) of this ordering of grace, established and desired by God Himself. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 29 ff.; iv. 7;

* [It is joined by some to χρηστότητι, but this seems a strange collocation. ELLICOTT takes the whole expression as "a single compound modal clause," "in kindness toward us" defining accurately the manner in which God displays "the riches of His grace," while "in Christ Jesus" specifies as it were, the ever-blessed sphere to which its manifestations are confined, and in which alone its operations are felt. The same author very properly remarks on DE WETTE's "melancholy want of appreciation" of the repeated mention of the name of Christ.—R.]

† [The variation in the reading does not affect this statement, since δια πίστεως would mean, through faith, taken abstractly, while τῆς πίστεως would mean *your* faith. As regards the meaning of "grace," it preserves the same wide sense as in ver. 5, and is "not to be regarded specially and technically as in the scholastic theology, and divided into *gratiæ præveniens, operans, co-operans;* the first having for its object *homo convertendus;* the second, *homo qui convertitur;* and the third, *homo conversus sed sanctificandus*" (EADIE). The force of the perfect as expressing both a terminated action and a present state should not be overlooked: Ye have been saved, and ye are actually now in a state of salvation.—R.]

* [Dr. HODGE presents four reasons for preferring the reference to faith. 1. "It best suits the design of the passage." Grant it, but that is of little weight when the other reference accords better with grammar and syntax. 2. "The other interpretation makes the passage tautological." Paul uses a great deal of such tautology. 3. "The antithesis between faith and works is preserved." But regard for an antithesis found in the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans should not outweigh regard for the parallelism of our own passage. 4. "The analogy of Scripture is in favor of this view." Very true, but as it represents *elsewhere* faith as the gift of God, so it represents *everywhere* that salvation is the gift of God.—It is to be regretted that so judicious an author had not stated the difficulties attending his view as well as these arguments in its favor.—R.]

2 Cor. x. 17 f.; Rom. iii. 27; iv. 2. Ἵνα is not to be taken as=ὥστε or as imperative (KOPPE). [MACKNIGHT objects that this is not a worthy end, therefore ἵνα is not telic. But it is only one end, and then it implies a great deal more than the mere stopping of man's boasts. The implied antithesis is: that God should have the glory, as ver. 10 indicates.—R.]

Ver. 10. **For his handiwork are we,** *αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν ποίημα.*—The genitive stands first with special emphasis; if there should be any boasting, He should be boasted of by us, His work.* Hence the connection by means of γάρ, for the reason is given why no one should boast. *Gratia tollit naturam.* What we are to understand by ποίημα, the Apostle sets forth in the following participial clause belonging to *ἐσμέν:*

Created in Christ Jesus for good works. —*Κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,* "created in Christ Jesus," is like 2 Cor. v. 17: *εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις.* Comp. Gal. vi. 15. The fellowship with Christ is the mediation conditioning the creative efficiency of God. "God's work" is a creation in Christ, by means of which there becomes a "new man" (ver. 15). A double creation is therefore not spoken of, the physical, that of the protoplast, in "His handiwork" (TERTULLIAN, GREGORY NAZ. and others), and the spiritual, that of the new birth in "created," nor are both creations to be regarded as united here (PELAGIUS, ERASMUS, MATTHIES, RUECKERT), so that we both as Christians and as men are God's work. Salvation alone is in question. Thus much only is true, that the expressions respecting the physical first creation are transferred to this ethical one, which is a new birth (Tit. iii. 5), a real creation (ver. 15; iv. 21, 22).

The preposition ἐπί with the dative marks both the end and the result; Gal. v. 13: *ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε;* 1 Thess. iv. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 14; WINER, p. 368. It is not=εἰς ἔργα ἀγαθά, hence not merely the end and aim of salvation [HODGE], (SCHENKEL). [ALFORD: "Just as a tree may be said to be created for its fruit."—R.] *Ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς* is in antithesis to *ἐξ ἔργων*, denoting that those created in Christ Jesus do perform good works, as "a peculiar people, zealous of good works" (Tit. ii. 14); such works are therefore not the cause but the consequence of being delivered.† Hence we read here not *ἔργοις* or *ἔργοις νόμου*, but, what is much more significant, *ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς:* good works are performed only by the regenerate.

Which God before prepared that we should walk in them, *οἷς προητοίμασεν ὁ θεός, ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν.*—As regards the construction it should first be remarked that the difficulty lies in *οἷς* and in the meaning of the verb *προητοίμασεν*, which requires an object in the accusative, as well as in the reference of the preposition *προ*. The relative *οἷς* can belong only to *ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς*, and since *προετοιμάζειν* cannot be taken as neuter (BENGEL) and there is no *ἡμᾶς* added, it must be explained by attraction (*Vulgate, Syriac*, down to BLEEK); *ἐν αὐτοῖς* follows, as in John v. 36. [That is, the relative is the object of the verb, which would be in the accusative (ἅ) were it not attracted into the case of its antecedent *ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς;* so E. V. and the vast majority of commentators.—R.] Προετοιμάζειν (Rom. ix. 23) is to prepare beforehand, here of things, as *προορίζειν* of persons (i. 11). [See below however.] The *προ totam rem Deo tribuit* (BENGEL), implying that they should be performed. It should be borne in mind that we do not find: *ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς, οἷς* —; the individual good works are not regarded as prepared before, but only *ἔργα ἀγαθά* in general. Christians are new-created for these; they are performed by the Christians not according to arbitrary choice; they are determined, as by the law, so by the Holy Ghost (GROTIUS: *quasi in mari aliquis et viam præsignaret et simul ventos daret ferentes*); they are given, to them is the Christian directed, equipped therefor with strength and desire.

God Himself has thus prepared before "good works," and that too with the design, to the end: "that we should walk in them," as prepared beforehand by God, as in the element in which the Christians' walk moves, in which the regenerate should prove themselves alive. This final clause is in antithesis to: "lest any man should boast" (ver. 9). HOFMANN, who (*Schriftbeweis*, II. 1, p. 365) rejects rightly the explanations, ordained before, predisposed in God's counsel, and accepts the proper conduct of humanity to God as once for all present in Christ, says excellently in further exposition (*ibid.* II. 2, p. 294): Our walk in Him is a walk in them (good works), so that *ἐν αὐτοῖς* has the emphasis, and *ἡμεῖς* is not missed in the first clause.

Accordingly *οἷς* cannot be referred to *κτισθέντες* and explained as masculine: for whom, to whom He has before ordained (ERASMUS, and necessarily RUECKERT also). It is altogether impossible to accept a Hebraism and construct thus: *ἐν οἷς ἵνα περιπατήσωμεν προητοίμασεν ὁ θεός* (BENGEL, KOPPE); but *προετοιμάζειν* is not= *velle, jubere.* Nor should *ἡμᾶς* be supplied from the context and the clause rendered: to which, or: for which He has prepared us before (LUTHER, RUECKERT but doubtfully, SCHENKEL). Nor should the verb be taken as neuter (BENGEL): for which He has already prepared, so that nothing is wanting (STIER). Nor should we say that God has prepared the circumstances for them (*bonos socios, præceptores, confessionarios, concionatores, sancta exempla aliaque incitamenta et occasiones*), as do MICHAELIS and OLSHAUSEN, following Catholic expositors. Nor does *προ* stand related to "created unto good works," as though the preparation of the works preceded the new creation of the man, and the men were redeemed for the works and for their sake, and the walk in good works were the final and supreme aim of the Divine revelation of grace and saving dealings with man (MEYER, SCHENKEL)

* [ALFORD: "The English reader is likely to imagine a contrast between 'not of *works*' and 'for we are His *workmanship*,' which can hardly have been in the mind of the Apostle." The word ποίημα becomes in Latin and English *poema, poem;* the same notion of poetry being the truest, highest work or creation, is found in other languages.—R.]

† [EADIE well sums up the argument of the Apostle, that salvation is not of works: 1. The statement that salvation is of works involves an anachronism; 2. Involves the fallacy of mistaking the effect for the cause. 3. Even such good works can have in them no saving merit, for we are His workmanship.—R.]

[The view of Braune is open to serious doubt in one point alone. The attraction from the accusative is by far the best solution of the grammatical question. The verb, which is not neuter, does not mean "predestinated," but "prepared before." Comp. *Romans*, p. 321. That notion is a fair inference, but does not necessarily belong to the word, as even HODGE admits. It may be allowed too that "good works" without the article does not of necessity refer to definite, particular actions, which God has appointed for the several believers. But the force of *προ* is not sufficiently taken into the account in the view advocated above, while HOFMANN's explanation seems to be an attempt to avoid a theological difficulty rather than a fair exegesis. *Προορίζειν* is distinguished from *προετοιμάζειν*, not by a difference of objects (as Braune holds, following HARLESS), but as follows: The end comes more into view in the former, the means more in the latter (so FRITZSCHE, LANGE, *Romans*, p. 320, EADIE, ELLICOTT). As the temporal relation to "created" seems to be the only proper reference in the preposition *προ*, we should accept this explanation: God, *before* we were created in Christ, *made ready* for us a sphere of moral action, a road, with the intent that we should walk in it, and not leave it; this sphere, this road, was "good works" (ELLICOTT).—Or yet more definitely, with ALFORD: As trees are created for fruits which God before prepared that they should bear them: *i. e.*, defined and assigned to each tree its own, in form, and flavor, and time of bearing. So in the course of God's providence, our good works are marked out for and assigned to each one of us. This does not seem to be open to the objection that it makes the works the supreme end of God's saving dealings. —EADIE: "These good works, though they do not secure salvation, are by God's eternal purpose essentially connected with it, and are not a mere offshoot accidentally united to it."—R.] BENGEL says aptly: ***Ambularemus, non salvaremur aut viveremus.***

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. THEOLOGICALLY: *God's nature* is designated by: "who is rich in mercy, for His great love" (ver. 4). Precisely as in 1 John iv. 16: "God is love" (comp. my notes, *Biblework in loco*, p. 146 f.). What He will ever more and more manifest and prove, is "the exceeding riches of His grace in kindness" (ver. 7). All salvation is traced back to "grace" (vers. 5-8), to "love" (*ἀγάπη*) now condescending in its entire fulness to the deepest misery, the lost condition of sinners (*χάρις*), in order to help (*ἔλεος*) as a master and to minister (*χρηστότης*) as a servant. How then can there be room for "wrath?" *Ὀργή* (from *ὀρέγω*, allied with reach, rack, stretch, and *ὀργάω*, to swell, to be full) designates first of all, appetite, emotion, then passion, anger. God is indeed holy love, hence precisely not an apathetic personality, not an epicurean *natura divom semota ab rebus nostris sejunctaque longa*, not a pagan or Turkish *εἱμαρμένη*, nor a modern moral order of the world, or mere "Providence," "Heaven," or the philosophical Absolute, or the common numb Deity. He loves, He must also be angry with what is unholy, evil; He has wrath, not as a man, *active et initiative*, but *passive et consecutive.* His wrath is the zeal of love against corrupting evil, the energy in the conduct of God against that relation to Him, established with the fall of the creature from Him; in the creature's sin God's wrath brings forth itself (STIER).—One thing besides should be especially considered. By "we," described in ver. 3, the Israelites are meant: precisely these, though chosen, are called on account of the apostasy of the human race, "children of wrath." Accordingly all, the entire fallen race, are the object of the wrath of God, even the elect, just as all are the object of His grace, as even these have been, who, because they will not let themselves be saved, are cast away. In mercy and anger is He the same God, and has before Him the human race in like manner undivided, in order to save it as the object of His love. Comp. FRANK, *Theologie der Form. Conc.*, IV. p. 194 ff.

2. CHRISTOLOGICALLY: The *Mediator*, in whom alone the fallen race, now a prey to the corruption of sin, is and can be an object of love to God, and through whom alone, yet certainly, the purpose of salvation conceived in Him, is consummated, is Jesus Christ, the Risen One, who, as the Sinless One, was not forfeit to death, but overcame it. The text only indicates this latter thought; but it distinctly asserts: *only in Him* is life, renewal, power, blessedness, without Him there is none of this (vers. 10, 5–7). In this entirely unique Person, including in Himself all that man needs for a renewal well-pleasing to God, presenting in His resurrection and exaltation, not merely a type, but the dynamic principle for the elevation of humanity to sonship with God—in this Person is set forth all that is specifically Christian in Christianity.

3. HAMARTOLOGICALLY: *a*) *The essence of sin is disobedience* ("sons of disobedience") to the will of God, and *obedience* to the *flesh* ("doing the wishes of the flesh and of the thoughts").

b) The *universality* of sin. It extends itself over the whole human race without exception. Gentiles (vers. 1, 2) and Jews (ver. 3), and among these (*ἡμεῖς πάντες*) to those also who like the Apostle were "taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and zealous toward God" (Acts xxii. 3); for fleshly self-will and obstinacy mingles itself as a ruling power, even in the most refined forms, with human virtue and honorableness.

c) The *variety* of sin does not condition a variety in the extent of guilt. To the Apostle the heathen world was a wrestling place of demons: Satan ruled it; there all goes according to his will; and the Apostle calls the Gentiles "sons of disobedience." The people of Israel, notwithstanding its theocracy, consists in his esteem of "children of wrath," as he designates them much more sharply. The guilt increases with the less considerable sins, if the favors received, which have been despised or neglected, are greater: so there may be less guilt with greater sins, and a far greater guilt with sins less great externally, because there is a greater sinful corruption.

d) The *corruption* of sin. Although some may hold for truth in Eph. v. 14 ("Awake thou that

sleepest and arise from the dead"), only "thou that sleepest," together with Rom. v. 6: "when we were yet without strength," the phrase "were dead" (vers. 1, 5) here may not be overlooked. The Romanists indeed say (*Conc. Trid. Sess.* VI. cap. 1): *liberum arbitrium minime extinctum esse, viribus licet attenuatum et inclinatum*, and MÖHLER speaks only of the *sleep* of sin (*Symbolik*, p. 100), but Paul says, in accordance with his Lord in the parable of him left "half-dead" (ἡμιθανῆ, Luke x. 30), that we are dead to what is good, robbed of the "life," which includes strength and activity in connection with entire satisfaction, *i. e.* happiness, and hence are powerless, inactive, cramped in our life-movement, troubled, dissatisfied and unhappy; it is therefore not merely a feeling of unhappiness, not merely the corruption of the intellectual, but also of the moral, in fact of all the powers of life, so that physical death cannot fail, nor yet the ἀπώλεια, eternal destruction. Indeed the physical life is so affected, that sin is the heritage of every child of man from birth, it is forfeit to death as well as to sin.

[EADIE: "While admitting the scriptural account of the introduction of sin, many have shaped their views of it from the connection in which they place it in reference to Divine foreknowledge, and so have sprung up the Supralapsarian and Sub-lapsarian hypotheses. Attempts to form a perfect scheme of Theodicy, or a full vindication of the Divinity, have occupied many other minds than that of Leibnitz. The relation of the race to its Progenitor has been viewed in various lights, and analogies physical, political and metaphysical, with theories of Creationism and Traducianism, have been employed in illustration, from the days of Augustine and Pelagius to those of Erasmus and Luther, Calvin and Arminius, Taylor and President Edwards. Questions about the origin of evil, transmission of depravity, imputation of guilt, federal or representative position on the part of Adam, and physical and spiritual death as elements of the curse, have given rise to long and labored argumentation, because men have looked at them from very different stand-points, and have been influenced in their treatment of the problem by their philosophical conceptions of the Divine character, the nature of sin, and that moral freedom and power which belong to responsible humanity. The *modus* may be and is among the deep things of God; but the *res* is palpable: for experience confirms the Divine testimony that we are by nature 'children of wrath,' *per generationem*, not *per imitationem*." Comp. the history of the Doctrine, *Romans*, pp. 191 ff.—R.]

These *walking* dead ones (vers. 2, 3) stand in the relation of slaves in Satan's kingdom, and so long as they are without help from above, they wallow ever deeper and deeper into misery and death. They have in Satan an ἄρχοντα, "prince," who works and rules in opposition to Christ, the Head of the Church. He has his personal, wicked will as ruler, according to which (κατά) unconverted sinners walk; he has in the existing tendencies of the age in the world, urging themselves as a norm, an assistant of his power, which surrounds all men, penetrates all, unperceived and unregarded (ἐξουσία τοῦ ἀέρος), which works as a spirit in the sons of disobedience (ver. 2). The lusts of the flesh also and its glory, of the "thoughts," the selfish thought, are channels of his influence, of the flow of his spirit into the children of wrath, to which he is himself forfeit and to which all are exposed, who do not permit themselves to be converted and redeemed. This truth is as startling as it is humbling. In and with the world-historical progress under God's gracious guidance Satan as the prince of darkness carries on his activity to the destruction of men.*

4. ANTHROPOLOGICALLY: Man appears here:

a. As the *creature of God* (αὐτοῦ ποίημα), in which however there is but a side reference to the fact of man's creation. Paul uses this (ver. 10) only as a substratum for his remarks respecting man's renewal and regeneration in Christ, holding this truth firmly however, just here, where man's ruin in sin is spoken of. This must never be forgotten: Every man, not merely Adam and Eve, those too who are born, are God's creatures. Even though the substance is given, out of which man is begotten and born, it exists only as the creative inworking of God. And although man is to be regarded continually as the creature of God, this does not exclude the second causes by means of which God since the close of the Hexaëmeron continues the work of creation (see FRANK, *Theol.*, F. c., I. p. 52), so that the Apostle can say: "by nature children of wrath." There is a two-fold nature, the original, created by God, the degenerated, corrupted by sin. So far as we are God's work and creation, is the nature of the body and the soul in organism and powers, good; but intruded sin has corrupted their nature which was in itself good. This leads to the second point.

b. As a member of his race (φύσει) and that from the point of time when his "nature," a production within humanity, begins, hence from his birth. As respects this he is "flesh," doing the wishes of the flesh and of the thoughts, is "dead in trespasses and sins." For humanity is a living whole and in it every individual partakes of the character of the whole. This permits no one to be a non-participant in the consequences of the first sin, and each individual has his natural share in the corruption thereof. There is however, notwithstanding, in him a capacity for being converted, redeemed, saved, which distinguishes him from the fallen angels, who do not possess this, and also from *lapis* or *truncus*, negatively, in that he holds himself not passively, but aggressively against God, and positively, in that he has been created by God for renewal in Christ, and has from the creation on such an *aptitudo* (see FRANK, p. 140 ff.). To his doings

* [In our section, immediately following i. 22, 23, the world is marked in distinct and telling contrast to the Church. "The Church has its head—κεφαλή; the world has its—ἄρχων. That Head is a man, allied by blood to the community over which He presides; that other prince is an unembodied spirit—an alien as well as a usurper. The one so blesses the church, that it becomes His 'fulness,' the other sheds darkness and distress all around him. The one has His Spirit dwelling in the church, leading it to holiness; the other, himself the darkest, most malignant, and unlovely being in the universe, exercises a subtle and debasing influence over the minds of his vassals, who are 'children of disobedience.' Matt. xiii. 38; John viii. 44; Acts xxvi. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 4." EADIE.—R.]

and his character there belongs however no activity or relation to the salvation given in Christ, although he can and will have a consciousness of his unhappiness as a "child of wrath," and has accordingly a certain knowledge (*obscura scintillula ejus notitia quid sit Deus*), or a *memoriter* knowledge of God and a longing for the removal of his need, and hence too will try in his conduct and plans many a way to help himself, without ever finding the right way and the effective means. He will rather be deceived by the lusts and be oftener and more powerfully moved by the wills of his flesh and of his selfish thought under the evil influences of his surroundings.

c. As a child of his age ("according to the course of this world") and his *nation*, breathing in the atmosphere of his time and his tribe, determined and swept on by the stream of the present, to which he belongs.

d. As member of a world, in which outside the Divine power the power of the kingdom of darkness secretly, noiselessly exercises its force all about and in the individual men, who are unbelieving and unconverted. Man has an individual, moral, national position, but stands related also to the cosmical power of the evil one as well as to the eternal power of God working above and within the world.

5. Soteriologically: *a*) The essence of salvation ("ye have been and are saved") out of the condition of death, wrought and strengthened by sin, is "life:" hence "quickened together" (ver. 5). Life is a gift, a gratuity of grace (*δῶρον*, ver. 8), but not so complete at once, that it only needs to be offered and taken into possession; it is a new creation (ver. 10), a creative renewal. Salvation is also conceived of as deliverance from the power and dominion of this world and its prince, as exaltation and redemption into the kingdom of God; hence "raised us up with Him, and made us sit with Him in heavenly places."

b) *The cause of salvation is God*, who quickens, raises and exalts, and especially His grace (vers. 5, 8). Comp. 1. This salvation is so little a life developing itself out of the natural character, that it is called a "gift of God," which is only to be received.

c) *The Mediator is Christ*. See 2.

d) The *condition* is faith: "through faith." The context shows that the object of faith is the Person of Christ (vers. 5, 6, 7, 10), in whom God and God's grace are known and grasped, grasped and known. The nature of faith is evidently thus defined, that it is no work, since in this salvation works are denied as antecedent ("not of works," ver. 9), and good works are designated only as subsequent thereto (ver. 10), but also, that it does not spring of itself on the soil of our heart or spirit, since salvation comes "not of yourselves:" faith is not from the natural man. But since salvation is the impartation of life, and that too in creative manner, faith itself must be conceived of as an accepting activity, an ethical act, or an ethical course of action, having its corresponding development. Still nothing further is predicated on this point.

["It is the uniform doctrine of the New Testament, that no man is saved against his will; and his desire to be saved is proved by his belief of the Divine testimony. Salvation by grace is not arbitrarily attached to faith by the mere sovereign dictate of the Most High, for man's willing acceptance of salvation is essential to his possession of it, and the operation of faith is just the sinner's appreciation of the Divine mercy, and his acquiescence in the goodness and wisdom of the plan of recovery, followed by a cordial appropriation of its needed and adapted blessings, or, as Augustine tersely and quaintly phrases it—*Qui creavit te sine te, non salvabit te sine te.* Justification by faith alone is simply pardon enjoyed on the condition of taking it." Eadie.—R.]

e) The *course of salvation*, according to vers. 5, 6: "quickened us together with Christ," "and raised us up with Him and made us sit with Him" "in Christ," as well as ver. 10: "created in Christ Jesus," is to be thus understood: that the salvation, given personally and actually in Christ, begins in man with a reviving, which is a "dying to sin" (Rom. vi. 1 f.), beginning first of all in the individual and having in him first its growth and development, but then extending itself over whole races and unfolding itself ever more gloriously in them, not indeed as a natural life left to itself, but as continually evoked and furthered by the supernatural grace in its riches (ver. 7), always in Christ, out from Christ, never away from Christ, beyond Christ, but on toward and up to Him.

6. Ethically: *a. The worth of morality* transcends all intellectual power. If ever a people was great in the latter respect, it was the Greeks, and yet to them applies what is said in vers. 1, 2: despite all science and art, despite all progress in the department of human mental culture and the earthly life, so that they have been for centuries the masters of the leading civilized nations, they have fallen and persisted in moral corruption.

b. The nature of morality is "good works," which God prepared before; they have been given since the beginning of the creation: in the written law the unwritten laws have been rendered, fixed and secured against alteration. The new creation in Christ has resumed and continued the first, not obsolete creation, not however as supplementing a defective one, but as renewing one disfigured and destroyed in man. God's dealings ordered from the beginning by Him are alone spoken of.

c. The basis of morality, which is the proper bearing of man towards the will of God, rests in the proper relation of man to God, into which he is transferred as a new creature in Christ. Since this is brought to pass through faith, faith itself is the basis of true Christian morality. From what is said respecting the people of Israel, it is manifest that even the law of God and many other salutary institutions can be in force, without helping or furthering this, if faith be lacking. But works cannot and may not be lacking to faith, if it is genuine: they are essential in the life of faith; even though not necessary for the sake of justification and to the attainment of eternal life, they are still necessary proofs of faith, and necessary on account of the *mandatum, ordinatio et voluntas Dei.* Since good works are not created by God, but Christians created for

them, and since Christians should perform them of their own free will under the impulse of the Spirit, faith must be the basis for these, the same faith by means of which the man becomes a new man. [The Gospel says "Live and do this," not "Do this and live," and the old maxim: *bona opera non præcedunt justificandum, sed sequuntur justificatum*, is here again proven Scriptural, as experience proves it the only possible order. The many battles on this point, the ever-recurring tendency in theology and in the heart of the Christian, to mix, confuse, contrast and oppose faith and works, find in the plain, pellucid statement of the Apostle their proper rebuke. Alas, such simple words have too often been tortured by expositors to support their theories.*—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Despite the amiable qualities and social virtues in the character, lovely mental gifts in the life of those who are not born of God, not born of His Spirit; they are still walking dead men, dead in the living body, in which the outer man is nobly upheld while the inward man perishes day by day.—Through trespasses and sins, through many, but little sins, little meannesses, trifling impurities, petty jealousies, which creep in secretly, lightly, unnoticed, and work so successfully for the death of man's soul,—it occurs that one otherwise honorable can be inwardly more corrupt, more thoroughly ruined, than one who has committed some great crime. Among the twelve disciples of Jesus, one was Judas the traitor!—Consider the experience of all Christians: only after conversion do they perceive the abomination of sin, its origin and its end, destruction. Here can man only *reflect*.—Most men appear well, but if they had at one time the thoughts and feelings which so often steal in upon them, in externally manifest and accomplished deeds before their eyes, their body would seem to them like a shroud, and their heart like a corpse, of a beloved one indeed, yet full of stench.—The spirit of the age of this world is never a good spirit. It does indeed occasionally appear to be so here and there, as in the time of the Reformation. This was born of God's Spirit and Word, and yet it was furthered by carnal hostility to the Pope, evil desires after the ecclesiastical possessions, after the treasures of the monasteries; godless movements against godless oppression; if God the Lord had not helped it by special events and circumstances, it would have been repressed or polluted—by the spirit of the age!—In evil there is system, progress, growth, development; a prince too and rulers, spirit and law; evil, darkness is a kingdom also, and at its head is a prince, the chief of the devils; from frivolous, temperate sinners to premeditated villains, and from sinful men to fallen angels, and among these there is gradation and connection, a kingdom, without peace and happiness, it is true.

Selfishness is a destructive pervading disease of one's own Ego, which dies of it. To live for self and only for self is a poor, pitiable life. What kind of a wife is that who will not live for her husband? what kind of a man is he who will not live for his calling? what kind of a human being is that who will not live for his God, but only for his lusts, capable of no sacrifice, except petty alms if he is rich; noble before men, before God a tatter, honored before men and yet the object of Divine wrath and of His sentence to perdition?—It is a sad contradiction among men, that they speak of the "dear God" [the common German phrase: *der liebe Gott*] and say, He is love, while no one is to them more uncomfortable and obnoxious than the Church, which makes this a matter of earnest, preaching of the love of the Father in Christ the Crucified and Risen One; they are tolerant toward sins in themselves and others, aye, toward vile sins, fornication, suicide, if there is any respectability about it, but tolerant toward the living and active members of the church they are certainly not, that is impossible for them. What then *do* they think of the love of God?—You may as little undervalue faith as the rudder, however small it is in a large ship. All labor in the rigging, in the masts and sails, at stem or stern, helps nothing even in the best of weather, much less in swell and storm, if the rudder is not in order and rightly used; so without faith you toss about in life, aimless, helpless, hopeless.—God did not first make the members and then out of them the body; man was at once entire. So too man is not born piecemeal, though small and weak, he is yet an entire human being. It is so with the new birth also. Conversion affects the whole man, is however only the first step, not perfection, is a beginning pointing and impelling toward advance and completion.

LUTHER:—That for which each thing is created, it does without law and compulsion. The sun shines by nature, unbidden; the pear-tree bears of itself, voluntarily; three and seven *ought not* to be ten, they *are* ten already. There is no need that one should say to God, He should do good, for He does all the time willingly and gladly of Himself. So too one should not command the righteous man, that he should do good works, for he does it without this, without command and compulsion, because he is a new creature and a good tree.—He should not be driven thereto, if his faith be not fancied and feigned.

STARKE:—He who does not walk in God's way, following the guiding star of God's will, gets other blind guides, and is induced to cut such capers, that he is plunged into extreme corruption.—The saints are free confessors of their sins, having no desire for hypocrisy to justify themselves.—All men are equally corrupted by original sin, although the corruption breaks out in various ways.—Evil lust is the root of all sins, even of sin itself.—Reason is a glorious gift of God, as the deprival of the same, madness, is a great misery and judgment. But it is much weakened and darkened through the fall, and hence inclined to many errors and prejudices, permitting itself to be abused.—Art thou poor in soul, here thou mayest find an inexhaustible

* [As a specimen of the mode by which human inferences and hypotheses can be added to Scripture to pervert it, take the declaration of the Council of Trent. *Sess.* VI. *cap.* 16: "The Lord's goodness to all men is so great that He will have the things which are His own gifts to be their merits"—*ut eorum velit esse merita quæ sunt ipsius dona* (from EADIE).—R.]

treasure of God's mercy, making us rich in Him. —Our salvation comes from God's compassionate love alone.—We are really quickened in Christ, by Christ and with Christ. Therefore we have a real not a fancied life, and there is as great a difference between a natural and a regenerated man as between those physically dead and alive. —Believers not only become blessed in the future, but they are really blessed, although their blessedness is still imperfect.—Without grace no one can believe, and without believing no one can partake of grace.—We are God's work as regards creation; but if we do not become so as regards sanctification and the application of redemption, we remain outside the fellowship with God.—Regeneration is a real creation and the source of all spiritual life.

RIEGER:—Living men cannot exactly understand that they are to regard themselves as *dead* through trespasses and sins. Weak they prefer admitting as applicable to them; and indeed the word of God does occasionally describe us as weak, as sick. But the Spirit of God does not mean this, as men gladly explain it. They confess themselves weak with the persuasion that they can make themselves better and become strong by self-improvement. The word of God, however, means a weakness, in which self-help is no longer possible, where the hope of recovery rests solely on the presence and power of the physician. As certainly as the body without the soul is dead, so certainly is the soul without the Spirit dead.—The walk and the occupation with which man commonly conceals this death, do not make the harm less, but rather the more dangerous.—That the time, the existing course of the world, the principles, opinions and habits arising therein, can operate largely in man, bearing him into much which he would not reach by himself, making his exit and freedom very difficult, should a longing for something better actually arise within him; this is quite readily perceived. But that a prince, a ruler of darkness, an expert power, extending as far as the air and clouds, lurks therein, that we do not know of ourselves, nor do we want to believe it, though it is proven by the word of God. The devil himself has the best interest in the fact that so little of his business is suspected among the dealings of men.—At first flesh and Reason can be for a while in conflict. Reason accuses the lusts of the flesh of being vile and unbecoming to man; but there is no power to free itself from them; and the flesh reproaches the reason with this inability and the consequent falsity of its assumed virtues, and so the two prefer to make peace with each other. The reason is reconciled with the flesh, helps to justify and excuse its lusts, paints a better external appearance for them, while the flesh for the sake of the praise occasionally crawls into a form not too coarse.—What will God yet do in future ages, that the riches of the grace of Christ may be yet more confidently proven, more gladly believed, and more uninterruptedly enjoyed!

PASSAVANT:—Our whole nature desires life, life is our thirst, we hate death! So often and so long as we trespass against the law of our conscience or God's law, is all holiness and righteousness dead within us; there lives then no love of God, no Spirit of the Lord, no joy in Him, no heavenly peace, no Divine life in us, that is, no real life.—If God's breath does not breathe afresh upon us with the power of the Divine nature, then education however careful, culture however refined, is mere patchwork and tinsel, no pure truth, no pure power from God, no new birth, no heavenly life.—We can learn from the reports of the gospel messengers, in what forms, in what follies and enormities the kingdom of superstition and unbelief has down to our days, multiplied and established itself. Every recollection of the holy and eternal, every trace, every presage of the unknown God in the human soul, has been degraded and distorted into the silliest and most infamous fictions and lies, into the most miserable and sinful abortions of idolatrous forms and worship.—Notice the language of Scripture. One and the same word in the text signifies unbelief and disobedience, for both these poisonous plants proceed from one and the same bitter root of the heart. You do not look with pleasure on Him, whom you will not obey; you do not keep Him in mind, nor inquire after Him.—Is thy obedience poor, then thy faith is not earnest; is thy faith not vital and genuine, then there is no child-like, earnest obedience.

HEUBNER:—Those are dead, who have died to all that is good and godly, in whom the spirit is benumbed and the flesh alone is active. There are grades of death as well as of life. Spiritual death manifests itself in the entire lack of knowledge respecting spiritual things, of desire, love, power for good; all taste for the Divine, all longing for God is wanting. This death is the result of sin. Christianity found the world dead and reanimated it. To be without God, without Christ, is death. The first stirring of life is anxiety about ourselves, the consciousness of misery and sin.—Fearful is the power, which the course, the spirit of the world, maintains over man. It distorts all his ideas. We must agree with it, if we would have peace, honor, respect and power; those who oppose it, are regarded with wrath. The *origin* of this spirit is in the prince of darkness. He who stands outside of Christ, stands in fellowship with Satan; for he thinks and lives in accordance with the maxims of the evil spirit.—"Prince of the power of the air!" This description is apt, because the evil spirit is not a visible member of human society, and yet is *about us*, in our circle, in the sublunary world.—Satan was therefore the ruling power in heathenism, and accordingly this cannot be regarded as a healthful and normal development of religion. His influence still continues.—To deny this activity of Satan is to bring water to his mill.—The bodily resurrection of Christ has as a consequence a spiritual resurrection of men.—It is contrary to the proud consciousness of man, to live by the grace of God, and yet he cannot live by any thing else than grace. All is of grace: that we may hear the gospel, God opens our understanding, and makes our hearts willing to believe.—What would have occurred had Christ not come? Socrates, Plato, Pythagoras appeared 4–500 years before Him—what had they helped the world? He who thinks that others would have come after them, who would have helped, will wait in vain for-

ever.—On the one side Paul excludes works, on the other he requires them.

STIER:—God not only raised Him from the dead, but the dead in Him.—The air which exhales from earth the old villain who hides therein and uses it, thoroughly knows how to turn and pour in opposition to the gales from heaven.—*Mercy* removes misery and death, Love appears instead of wrath, blessing, delivering, saving.—First life, the new creature, then we may speak of walk and good works.—Life, as just begun, is not complete, does not stand still, but grows, develops, forms and employs itself. It proceeds from the Risen One continually as the Spirit of sanctification.

SPURGEON:—*Spiritual quickening:* Jairus' daughter, the young man at Nain, Lazarus, 1) Illustrations of the different circumstances in which those who are really dead are to be found; 2) Illustrations of the various means of grace through which they are quickened by the power of the same Spirit; 3) Illustrations of experiences through which those who have been made alive pass after their quickening.

LANGBEIN:—The glorification of Christ, the glorification of Redeemed ones: 1) God has quickened us together with Him, 2) raised us together with Him, 3) transferred us into heavenly places in Him.—*Gesetz und Zeugniss:* Bow thy knees and rejoice over the great gracious plan of God: 1) that we fully survey it in Christ, 2) that each of us has his place in it, 3) that it has become actual in many respects through the word and faith and in the Holy Ghost.

[SCHENKEL:—Sin a fountain of death in apparent life.—The kingdom of Satan in its dreadfulness and nothingness.—The blessedness of the Christian: 1) It has a firm basis, that of grace; 2) It leads them to a certain way, that of faith.—Our hope that in the course of ages God will manifest Himself yet more gloriously by means of the grace and truth made known in Christ. "Faith opens our eyes, ears, mind and heart; giving us (1) the heavenly desire, (2) the Divine knowledge, (3) the Divine taste, (4) the truth of life" (from PASSAVANT).—R.]

[EADIE:—Ver. 1. The epithet "dead" here implies: 1. Previous life; 2. Insensibility; 3. Inability. He cannot because he will not, and therefore he is justly responsible.—Ver. 2. They did not pursue indulgences fashionable at a former epoch, but now obsolete and forgotten. Theirs were not the idolatries and impurities of other centuries. No; they lived as the age on all sides of them lived—in its popular and universal errors and delusions; they walked in entire conformity to the reigning sins of the times.—Ver. 3. *Si Deus non irascitur impiis et injustis, nec pios justosque diligit* (LACTANTIUS).—Ver. 4. Though mercy has been expended by God for six milleniums, and myriads of myriads have been partakers of it, it is still an unexhausted mine of wealth.—The love is great—a great God is its possessor and great sinners are its objects.—Ver. 5. Life may be feeble at first, but the sincere milk of the word is imbibed and the expected maturity is at length reached. Its first moment may not indeed be registered in the consciousness, as it may be awakened within us by a varying process.—Ver. 6. The quickened soul is not merely made aware that in Christ, as containing it and all similar souls, it is enlivened, and raised, and elevated, but along with this it enjoys individually a conscious life, resurrection and session with Jesus.—Ver. 7. All the grace in this kindness shown in the first century is a lesson even to the nineteenth century. What God did then, He can do now and will do now; and one reason why He did it then was, to teach the men of the present age His ability and desire to repeat in them the same blessed process of salvation and life.—Ver. 8. Look at salvation in its origin—it is "by grace;" in its reception—it is "through faith;" in its manner of conferment—it is a "gift."—Ver. 9. If man be guilty, and being unable to win a pardon, simply receives it; if, being dead, he gets life only as a Divine endowment; if favor, and nothing but favor, has originated his safety, and the only possible act on his part be that of reception; if what he has be but a gift to him in his weak and meritless state—then surely nothing can be further from him than boasting, for he will glorify God for all.—R.]

---

2. *Extolling comparison of their previous and their present condition.*

CHAP. II. 11-22.

11 Wherefore remember, that ye *being* in time past Gentiles, [that once[1] ye, Gen-
tiles] in the flesh, who are called [the] Uncircumcision by that which is called the
12 [or by the so-called] Circumcision in the flesh made [wrought] by hands; That at
that time[2] ye were [ye were at that time] without Christ, being aliens [alienated]
from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of [the] pro-
13 mise, having no hope, and without God in the world: But now, in Christ Jesus, ye
who sometime [once] were far off are made [were brought][3] nigh by [in] the
14 blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath [*omit* hath] made both one, and
hath broken down the middle wall of partition *between us* [and broke down the

15 middle wall of the partition,]; Having abolished [or done away][4] in his flesh the
enmity, *even* the law of [the] commandments *contained* [*expressed*] in ordinances;
for to make in himself of twain [that he might create the two in himself[5] into] one
16 new man, *so* making peace; And that he might reconcile both [And might recon-
cile them both][6] unto God in one body by [in one body to God through] the cross,
17 having slain the enmity thereby [on it]: And [he] came and preached peace to
you which [who] were afar off, and [peace][7] to them that [those who] were nigh.
18 For through him we both have [our][8] access by [in] one Spirit unto the Father.
19 Now therefore [So then] ye are no more [longer] strangers and foreigners [sojourn-
ers], but [ye are][9] fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God;
20 And are built [Built up] upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus
21 Christ [Christ Jesus][10] himself being the chief corner *stone;* In whom all the
building[11] fitly framed together groweth [is growing] unto a holy temple in the
22 Lord: In whom ye also are [being] builded together for a habitation of God
through [in] the Spirit.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 11.—[ℵ.[3] D.[3] K. L., and a number of versions and fathers support the order of the *Rec.* (ὑμεῖς ποτέ), which Braune seems to prefer, but Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer and English editors accept the reading of ℵ.[1] A. B. D.[1] (ποτὲ ὑμεῖς). The former arose from a regard for euphony in all probability. The pointing adopted above accepts τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί as in simple apposition to ὑμεῖς, a view strengthened by the correct reading (see Ellicott).—The usage respecting the article in English differs from that in Greek, as the alterations in this verse indicate.—R.]

[2] Ver. 12.—[The *Rec.* inserts ἐν before τῷ καιρῷ, with D.[3] K. L., and some versions, but it is omitted in ℵ. A. B. D.[1] F., by most fathers; rejected by nearly all modern editors (Hodge retains it without remark) as an explanatory gloss, the preposition being more usual and perhaps more correct in such cases.—The same gloss occurs in the *Rec.* again (iii. 5).—R.]

[3] Ver. 13.—[The *Rec.* reads ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθητε, on the authority of D. F. K. L., Greek fathers; accepted by Meyer, Ellicott and others, on the ground of the contrast with μακράν. Lachmann, Alford, Braune. and others accept the order of ℵ. A. B., versions, which is quite as well supported.—On the emendations see *Exeg. Notes.*—R.]

[4] Ver. 15.—[As Braune adopts the construction favored by the E. V., only verbal changes have been made in the first half of this verse. But it is doubtful whether this is correct. The other prominent opinions require the following renderings: "Broke down the middle wall of the partition—*to wit*, the enmity—in His flesh, having made void the law of the commandments *expressed* in decrees" (Ellicott). This joins ἔχθραν in apposition to μεσότοιχον, and ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ to λύσας. The other view, that of Meyer, De Wette, Hodge (and preferred in the additional notes), accepts the apposition, but joins "in His flesh" to "abolished:" "Broke down the middle wall of partition, to wit, the enmity, having in His flesh done away the law," *etc.* In any case we ought to put a comma instead of a colon at the close of ver. 14.—R.]

[5] Ver. 15.—[The *Rec.*, ℵ.[3] D. K. L., most cursives and fathers read: ἑαυτῷ, accepted by Meyer and most commentators. ℵ.[1] A. B. F., 10 mss.: αὐτῷ, accepted by Lachmann, Alford. The authorities are about equally divided, the latter being the more difficult reading, too difficult in fact, since the pronoun must be referred to Christ, and that would be intolerably harsh with this reading. Besides the Greek ε might easily be dropped, either from the interchange of forms, or after ἐν, as Meyer suggests.—The E. V. is very unfortunate in the structure of its clauses here, making two co-ordinate final clauses differ as widely as possible in form.—R.]

[6] Ver. 16.—[We may render here: *both of us* with equal correctness.—*Reconcile again* may be the true meaning, but I hesitate in adopting it.—*In one body* is to be closely connected with *both*. *To* instead of *unto* (E. V.) for the simple dative.—*Through* best expresses the sense of διά.—*On it* is more exact than *thereby*, the reference being to the cross.—We might put a period at the close of this verse, but the insertion of the subject in verse 17, indicates the want of close connection.—R.]

[7] Ver. 17.—ℵ. A. B. D. E. F. G. and others: εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς. The emphatic repetition is well attested, and an omission by the transcribers is more probable than an insertion. [So all modern editors and commentators, even the most conservative as regards the *Recepta*.—R.]

[8] Ver. 18.—[The article here is almost equivalent to the possessive.—The E. V. again renders ἐν, *by*.—R.]

[9] Ver. 19.—[The *Rec.* omits ἐστέ, with D.[3] K. L., versions and fathers; but it was probably deemed superfluous, instead of emphatic; it is found in ℵ. B. (both ἀλλά ἐστε), A. C. D.[1] F., accepted by modern editors.—R.]

[10] Ver. 20.—[The *Rec.* reads Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ on the authority of C. D. E. F. G. K. L., several versions and a number of fathers; accepted by Scholz, De Wette, Meyer, Ellicott. ℵ.[2] A. B., the Vulgate and other versions, some fathers, support the order: Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ; adopted by Tischendorf, Lachmann, Alford and others. ℵ[1] has only τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which Braune seems to favor. On the whole the order of the *Rec.* should be given up.—R.]

[11] Ver. 21.—[The *Rec.* inserts ἡ between πᾶσα and οἰκοδομή (ℵ.[2] A. C., some cursives), but it is omitted in ℵ.[1] B. D. E. F. G. K. L., most cursives, and is rejected by nearly all modern editors. The briefer reading is difficult, and the change was an easy way of avoiding it, just as following the *Rec.* now-a-days saves a little trouble to the commentator.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Detailed description of their previous condition. Vers. 11, 12.*

* [Dr. Hodge gives the following analysis of this paragraph: I. Their former relation,—1. To the Church as foreigners and aliens. 2. To God as those who were far off, without any saving knowledge of Him, or interest in His promise—vers. 11, 12.—II. The means by which this alienation from God and the Church has been removed, *viz.*, by the blood of Christ. 1. Satisfying the demands of justice it secured reconciliation with God. 2. Abolishing the law in the form of Mosaic institutions, it removed the wall of partition between the Jews and Gentiles—both are united in one body and reconciled to God—vers. 13–18.—III. The Ephesians are therefore united with God and His people. 1. They are represented as fellow-citizens of the saints. 2. They are members of the family of God. 3. They are constituent portions of that temple in which God dwells by His Spirit—vers. 19–22.—R.]

Ver. 11. **Wherefore remember.**—Διό, "wherefore," refers, like i. 15: διὰ τοῦτο, to the preceding section (STIER, BLEEK), since the object of "remember" is their previous quite as well as their present condition, or the "creating" of those who were "dead." *Talis recordatio gratum animum acuit et fidem roborat* (BENGEL), taking into view not merely the obtained riches, but also the poverty and misery from which they were released. The reference to vers. 5-10 (MEYER) is not correct, since ver. 5 resumes the object of vers. 1-3, and ver. 4 contains the subject, nor that to the last thought only (CHRYSOSTOM), since this sums up the whole. [ELLICOTT suggests the reference "to the declaratory portion of the foregoing paragraph, vers. 1-7; vers. 8-10 being an argumentative and explanatory addition.—R.]

That once ye, Gentiles in the flesh, ὅτι ὑμεῖς ποτὲ [ποτὲ ὑμεῖς] τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί.—(See *Textual Note* [1].] The ἦτε (ver. 12), introduced by the resumptive ὅτε after the apposition, belongs here, so that it need not be supplied. "Ye" means those who are now Christians (σεσωσμένοι), and that they have been "Gentiles in the flesh" is marked by ποτέ. Accordingly τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί is a predicatory appositional phrase. The article marks the designation as one well-known, the substantive, which in itself has no dishonorable meaning, being used with a reference to גּוֹיִם, and thus with the additional notion of a fault. Accordingly, Paul adds, "in the flesh." This is not κατὰ σάρκα (vi. 5; Rom. ix. 3, 5; 1 Cor. x. 18), which denotes a relation, while here a status is spoken of, one which has been, but is no longer existing (ποτέ). Joined without the article it forms with "Gentiles" one conception: *Goim* in the flesh, denoting what is external: Ye former heathen in the flesh, in the natural condition, uncircumcised, without a sign of the covenant, not even externally, in the flesh, endowed with the known sign of the people of God. [Σάρξ is taken in this its simple meaning by nearly all later commentators (MEYER, ELLICOTT, ALFORD, HODGE, EADIE, for the very good reason that the context plainly points to it, especially ἐν σαρκί just below. Braune's view of the construction is also the usual one.—R.] Otherwise we must take τὰ ἔθνη without any reference to heathenism and the therewith connected deficiencies, as the *nations excepting Israel*, and find its quality denoted in the added phrase, as designating what was defective in them. BENGEL: *hoc considerate Paulus conjungit cum* GENTES; *nam Judæi gentes simpliciter dicebunt præputium, non præputium in carne*—Gentiles, not Gentiles in the flesh. Hence it is incorrect to take ἐν σαρκί =*natalibus, origine carnati* (GROTIUS); for this they would continue to be. Nor does it designate the carnal mind, the unholy life (AMBROSE, ANSELM, CALOVIUS), nor has it a typical reference (STIER) for which Heb. vii. 16; ix. 10, give no occasion.

Who are called the Uncircumcision by that which is called [the so called] Circumcision in the flesh wrought by hands [οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου.].—Ἀκροβυστία, "uncircumcision," is evidently in apposition to "Gentiles in the flesh," and οἱ λεγόμενοι, already prepared for by τά before ἔθνη, is placed first for emphasis. The nations are called "Uncircumcision" on account of heathenism, the absence of the sign of the covenant in the flesh. The abstract noun, denoting here the essential point, is here a name also; hence it stands for the concrete = the uncircumcised. Col. iii. 11; Gal. ii. 7; 1 Cor. vii. 19, and περιτομή = the circumcised. In the phrase "who are called the Uncircumcision," the fact that they *were* (LUTHER) and are so termed, is stated here objectively, while in ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς, instead of τῶν λεγομένων, which *is* called, instead of *are* called, it is indicated that the thing and the name do not coincide in the same way, *i. e.*, by the so-called circumcision, the so called circumcised.* Accordingly the added phrase "in the flesh," corresponding precisely with "in the flesh" in the last clause, marks the externalness, in the flesh where it takes place.

Χειροποιήτου, "wrought by hands," is added with special emphasis, forming the antithesis to ἀχειροποιήτῳ, Col. ii. 11, and to what is perfect, wrought by God (Heb. ix. 11, 24; Acts vii. 48; xvii. 24). It has a typical reference, as the passages in Hebrews plainly affirm, so that this reference is not contained in ἐν σαρκί, which is not opposed to ἐν πνεύματι, either here or in the previous clause (STIER). Hence we should connect closely "circumcision in the flesh," and explain: which is made by hands in the flesh (MEYER, BLEEK). There is indeed a special significance in circumcision, which is mentioned by Moses (Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6), and the prophets (Jer. iv. 4; ix. 24, 25; Ezek. xliv. 7, 9). This the Apostle does not wish to undervalue; he only does not permit it to pass for something merely external, over against that of the heart, wrought by God (Phil. iii. 3: Rom. ii. 29; Col. ii. 11), to which that wrought in the flesh points.† He marks here the Jew in the people of Israel; the Jew, who remains satisfied with this external mark of the covenant with Israel, is a so-called circumcised one, and exalts himself without reason arrogantly above the uncircumcised and unclean nations. How miserable must be the condition of the heathen, who are despised by the Jew! So much the more glorious is it that they as Christians are now exalted above the latter. Hence we should not accept here a repugnance toward the Jews (RUECKERT), or an advantage of the Gentiles (CHRYSOSTOM), or the opinion, that uncircumcision was no detriment to the Gentiles, and circumcision no advantage to the Jews (CLARIUS). *In ea æqualitate, quam antea commemorat apostolus, nunc latentem inæqualitatem profert, ut Gentes, quo longius a Deo abfuerant, eo plura se gratiæ Dei debere fateantur* (BEZA).

Ver. 12. **That ye were at that time** [ὅτι ἦτε τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ].—Ὅτι, "that," is a resumption of the first ὅτι (ver. 11), and connects with "remember," adding to the *status miserabilior* of the heathen, already defined, the inner side. The verb placed first for emphasis marks the past, and τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ, the dative of time (Luke xii 20: ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί; WINER, p. 205) renders it even more prominent than ποτέ (ver. 11).

Without Christ, χωρὶς Χριστοῦ.—Χωρίς *ad subjectum, quod ab objecto sejunctum est, refertur,* ανευ, *ad objectum, quod a subjecto abesse cogitandum est* (TITTMANN, *Syn.*, I. 93 ff.). Thus χωρὶς Χριστοῦ affirms: the heathen are in a condition, where they are deprived of Him: *vos eratis*

* [The Gentiles were called and really were the ἀκροβυστία: the Jews were called the περιτομή, but were not truly so" (ELLICOTT).—R.]

† [Here again ELLICOTT is excellent. He renders: *performed by hand in the flesh*, to bring out the connection more accurately, and calls the phrase "a tertiary predication added by the Apostle reflectively rather than descriptively; 'the circumcision,—yes, hand-wrought in the flesh; only a visible manual operation on the flesh, when it ought to be a secret spiritual process in the heart; only κατατομή, not περιτομή.' "—R.]

*procul a Christo; ἄνευ Χριστοῦ esset; Christus non aderat vobis.** "Christ" refers to the promised One, the eternal Son of God; since a time is spoken of when He had not appeared in the form of a servant. Hence the name "Jesus" is not inserted. Christ, by means of ἐπιδημία νοητή (OLSHAUSEN), as the Angel of the Covenant (RUECKERT), dwelt already in the people of Israel (see 1 Cor. x. 4), and the people of God stood in an attitude of longing, hope, trust and faith, towards the coming One. The antithesis is in ver. 13: "in Christ Jesus." Hence we have here the summary which is expanded in the succeeding clause; this is not then a first point followed by a second and third (SCHENKEL), but a κεφάλαιον. [HODGE takes the following clauses as a confirmation of this phrase, but ELLICOTT, more correctly, as an elucidation of its significance.—R.] It is incorrect also to explain it as = *sine Christi fide vel notitia* (ANSELM, CALOVIUS).

Being alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.—This is the first of two co-ordinate members of one thought; it describes the external relation, the other the internal. We have marked here, a separation from the πολιτεία of the people of Israel, which has become and will become ever greater, and at the same time an internal estrangement (comp. iv. 18; Col. i. 21). The word indicates, if not an original fellowship, still an earlier nearness and equality. BENGEL: *Abalienati, non: alieni; participia præsupponunt, gentes ante defectionem suam a fide patrum, imo potius ante lapsum Adami fuisse participes lucis et vitæ.* So RUECKERT, OLSHAUSEN, STIER. [MEYER does not think this notion of a previous fellowship is here implied. ALFORD: "Gentiles and Jews were once united in the hope of redemption—this was constituted, on the apostasy of the nations, into a definite πολιτεία for the Jews, from which and its blessings the Gentiles were alienated." To which ELLICOTT adds: "The Gentile lapsed from it, the Jew made it invalid (Matt. xv. 6, comp. Chrysostom); and they parted, only to unite again (ἔθνη καὶ λαοὶ Ἰσραήλ, Acts iv. 27) in one act of uttermost rebellion, and yet, through the mystery of redeeming love, to remain thereby (vers. 15, 16) united in Christ forever."—R.]

By πολιτεία (ARISTOTLE: τῶν τὴν πόλιν οἰκούντων τάξις τις) we necessarily understand here according to the context the constitution of the State, the external polity, from which the Gentiles were ever further removed; a reference to the theocracy also is of course included. Hence too the theocratic name of honor, of "Israel" (Gen. xxxii. 28), not "of the Jews." *Tota respublica Israelis spectabat Christum* (BENGEL). Comp. John i. 48; Rom. ix. 4, 6; 2 Cor. xi. 22; Gal. vi. 16. The genitive τοῦ Ἰσραήλ denotes the possessor, the usufructuary, of the πολιτεία. [So ELLICOTT, who rightly insists that the word marks their *religious* and *spiritual*, rather than their national or political distinctions. HODGE and ALFORD accept as more simple the view of HARLESS, that the genitive is that of the identical nation: "the commonwealth which is Israel." ALFORD notices that the word "alienated" requires an objective reality as its reference, hence the meaning mentioned next is to be rejected.—R.] Certainly we should not refer this to the civil constitution (ANSELM, GROTIUS), for which a Roman or Greek could have no desire; what the Gentiles, who became Christians, lacked previously and now possessed, was certainly not "places of honor" or "citizenship in the Jewish State" (HARLESS). We should not then think of citizenship (BULLINGER, CALVIN).

And strangers from the covenants of the promise, καὶ ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν* τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.—This clause is closely connected with the preceding (καὶ), as a formula. So too the words correspond: "strangers" to "alienated," "covenants" to "polity," "promise" to "Israel." "Strangers" respects what has come to pass in the course of development or the internal position, which that development furthers (BULLINGER: *eandem rem significat utraque, nisi quod posterius prius*); "covenants" designates the repeated renewal of the covenant from Abraham to Moses (Gen. xii. 2 f. 7; xiii. 15; xv. 18; xvii. 20; xxii. 16 ff.; xxvi. 2 ff.; xxviii. 13 ff.), to the prophets; the context speaks merely of the time before Christ. All these repeated agreements, however, serve the *one* promise given to Abraham referring to all nations as well as characterizing the covenants, and reechoing again and again. So in Rom. ix. 4: "the covenants" and "the giving of the law" are placed side by side. Hence this is not to be referred to the two covenants, the old and the new (CALOVIUS and others), or to the two tables of the law (BEZA and others).

Having no hope, *etc.*—Here again we have two clauses connected and belonging together. Ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες, "having no hope," owing to the absence of the article, denotes that they have no hope of any kind; not merely a definite hope, but all hope is denied in their case. Hence we should not understand it of the resurrection and eternal life (BULLINGER, GROTIUS), or of the promised possessions (ESTIUS, BENGEL), as the object of the hope, nor indefinitely of deliverance (HARLESS). At most we might join to it from the following ἄθεοι, in accordance with Acts xxiv. 15: "toward God," πρὸς (εἰς) τὸν θεόν. In 1 Thess. iv. 13 we find the expression used as absolutely as here. The negative μή is used with the participle in this

* [On this distinction EADIE remarks: "Not to contradict this refinement, we might add, that ἄνευ, allied to *in, un, ohne*, might, in a general sense, signify privation; but χωρίς marks that privation as caused by separation. The Gentiles are viewed as being not merely without Him, but far away from Him. Their relation to Him is marked by a great interval—χωρίς. But, as Ellicott says, 'this distinction must be applied with caution, when it is remembered that χωρίς is used forty times in the New Testament, and ἄνευ only three times.'"—The connection of this phrase with ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι: "that at that time, being without Christ, ye were excluded from theocratic privileges" (DE WETTE, following the punctuation of LACHMANN, EADIE, though not decidedly in his second edition), is properly deemed harsh by ELLICOTT and ALFORD, though it ought not to be termed "clumsy beyond precedent" by the latter, since there are no clumsy tricks possible in interpretation that have not found a field for their exhibition in Biblical Exegesis (?)!—R.]

* [The genitive seems to be one of *privation*, or inverted possession. Bernhardy, *Syn.* iii. 49, p. 171; Kühner, ii. 163. Comp. WINER, p. 185, who takes the genitive here as one of separation, properly following the noun ξένοι. ELLICOTT: genitive of the point of view.—R.]

clause, which is dependent on *μνημονεύετε*, "remember," as a subjective negative. WINER, p. 444. Accordingly this clause is not to be put in dependence upon the preceding "strangers," *etc.* (BENGEL: *si promissionem habuissent, spem habuissent illi respondentem;* HARLESS); the clause would thus also be loosened from its close connection with the following one: *καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.*

Without God.—Ἄθεος is stronger than *χωρὶς θεοῦ*, corresponding to *θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει* (2 John 9; 1 John ii. 23), = "not having God." The essence of heathenism is Atheism (Rom. i. 21 ff.); the worship of devils and *εἴδωλα* (1 Cor. x. 20; xii. 2) does not take the place of God; "for polytheism is atheistic," and that philosophy is first correct, which throws this off in its thoughts respecting God. BENGEL: *non statuerant, nullos esse deos* (Acts xix. 35): *sed verum Deum ignorabant; tantum aberat, ut haberent* (1 Thess. iv. 5). He who is ἄθεος is, not merely as respects religion, but also as respects morality, God-less, and heathen immorality is different from Jewish immorality. Hence HARLESS should not wish to exclude this as if it were true enough but not pertinent here, where the distinction from the people of Israel is set forth, they being however included also under sin. MEYER, against the context, weakens the idea, by taking it as passive: God-forsaken. [Of the three senses of ἄθεος: *active* opposed to God), *neuter* (ignorant of God, without the subordinate notion of impiety, which Braune prefers), and *passive* (forsaken of God, without God's help), the latter seems most prominent here, and is accepted by HODGE, EADIE, ELLICOTT, ALFORD, mainly on the ground that the whole passage is passive in its character. This is the gloomiest view, and hence the more probable one, though the others stand so closely related to it, that it is hardly correct to term this a weakening of the idea.—R.] The connection with the preceding clause is evident, God is the God of hope (Rom. xv. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 16). Comp. *Doctr. Note*, 2.

In the world, *ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*, sets forth the antithesis to "the commonwealth of Israel," denoting the "ungodly where" (MEYER), and marking in any case the fearful element of *ἄθεος*, the place, where "sure hope, a firm hold" is so urgently needed (OLSHAUSEN), the place without the Creator in the service of nature and the creature, without a Redeemer in need and sin, without consolation and salvation in vanity and nothingness. Hence it is not=*inter ceteros homines, in his terris* (KOPPE), in profane humanity, the heathen world (MEYER), or in the world created and ruled by God (GROTIUS, RUECKERT).

Finally it must be remarked in regard to the structure of this sentence, that the two pair of clauses which unfold the meaning of "without Christ," each contain two related connected thoughts, and the two in the first pair stand in such a relation to the two in the second pair, that the first corresponds to the fourth and the second to the third. [The various correspondences as well as the relation to the leading clause of the verse are aptly expressed by EADIE: "Being *Christless*, they are described in regular gradation as being *churchless*, *hopeless*, *godless* and *homeless*."—R.]

Ver. 13. *Fundamental trait of their present condition.*—**But now, in Christ Jesus** [*νυνὶ δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*].—The thought of this verse is still in dependence on "remember" (ver. 11); the Apostle however breaks off into the independent, antithetical form. "But now" is in contrast with "once" (ver. 11), "at that time" (ver. 12), and as there the past was described by "without Christ," so here the present by "in Christ Jesus;" the latter form being fuller than the former, because the Promised One has come, the eternal Son of God has become man.* The Apostle does not refer to "the 'now' of the present 'simply,' but to the present in their fellowship with Christ" (HARLESS). Still we need not supply either *ἐστε* (BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS) or *ὄντες* (CALVIN), nor connect the phrase exclusively with "now" (HARLESS); both belong to *ἐγενήθητε* below, in fact to the whole sentence.

Ye who once were far off were brought nigh in the blood of Christ, *ὑμεῖς οἱ ποτὲ ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγενήθητε ἐγγὺς ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.*—The position of the words obliges us to regard *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* as rendered specially prominent, as a general definition of modality, and *ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, "in the blood of Christ," as a special one, so that the latter is to be taken as a more precise explanation of the former; it is not then in apposition with it; both belong to the verbal notion "were brought nigh." Then again "ye" has *now* another qualification than before: "who were once far off," as corresponding to ver. 12 ("alienated"—"strangers"). Comp. ii. 17; Acts iii. 39; xvii. 27 ("though He be not far from every one of us"); Mark xii. 34 ("Thou art not far from the kingdom of heaven"). These words have a reference figuratively to our relation to God; the heathen are thus spoken of in prophecy (Isa. xlix. 1; lx. 3, 4; lxvi. 19; lv. 5; lvii. 19) in their relation to both God Himself and His people. BUCER: *qui hactenus non fuisti populus domini, jam estis populus domini.* The distance and nearness include both the relation to God and that to His people; hence should not be referred either to the former alone (MATTHIES), or to the latter alone (RUECKERT, OLSHAUSEN, BLEEK). BENGEL: *procul a populo Dei et a Deo.* It is not sufficient to say: *longe eratis a cognitione Dei veri et a spe vitæ cœlestis* (GROTIUS), still less: *μακράν homines miserrimi, ἐγγύς, felicissimi* (KOPPE). The approach is something which develops (*ἐγενήθητε*), has a history;† the means rest in and proceed from what is expressed by: "in the blood of Christ." This is almost=" through his blood," *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ* (i. 7); the prepositions *ἐν* and *διά* are, however, both used in Col. i. 16: *ἐν αὐτῷ—δι' αὐτοῦ.* The latter denotes the cause, through which any thing takes place, comes into position or existence, the former the permanent ground,

* [The reference to the personal Messiah, to Jesus of Nazareth, who is the Christ, seems to be quite certain (comp. ELLICOTT and EADIE).—R.]

† [The verb is the aorist passive, expressing the effect of a definite event in the past, though the idea of *becoming* or being gradually brought is not to be forgotten. They were brought nigh, they became nigh through the instrumentality of another.—R.]

on which it has its continuance.* (WINER, p. 362. The word "Christ" here has special significance: it marks the Son of God beside the word "blood," which marks "the form of a servant."

Closer explanation respecting the nature and genesis of their present condition. Vers. 14–18.

Ver. 14. **For he is our peace** [*αὐτὸς γάρ† ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν*].—The position is emphatic, "He," not the unemphatic subject, but He Himself (WINER, p. 142). [He and none other; so most commentators.—R.] His Person is "our peace." The article marks the peace as well-known, more closely defined. BENGEL aptly says: *pax, non modo* PACIFICATOR; *nam* SUI *impensa pacem peperit et ipsi vinculum est* UTRORUMQUE. The allusion to passages in prophecy (Mic. v. 4; Isa. ix. 5, 6; lii. 7; liii. 5; Zech. ix. 10, *etc.;* also Ps. lxxii.) is unmistakable. This is denied by BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS. The Messiah is indeed called שָׁלוֹם, not merely Prince of Peace, *εἰρηνοποιός*. The genitive *ἡμῶν*, "our," merely denotes that the peace belongs to them, does not say whether the peace is among themselves or between them and God. This is determined by the context. On the nature of this peace, see Doctr. Note 3 *b*.

Who made both one, *ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἕν*.—He is therefore "the peace" through an act (*ὁ ποιήσας* with *αὐτός*, *quippe qui fecit*), which is set forth here only generally: made one, *ἓν ποιεῖν*. Here we find a closer definition of the idea "peace," not of "our," as the neuter requires. *Τὰ ἀμφότερα*, like *τὰ μωρά*, *ἀσθενῆ, κ. τ. λ.*, 1 Cor. i. 27 f., designates the general: what is of two kinds, "what opposes because sundered" (MATTHIES). The annulling of an existent variance is thereby noted as the nature of the peace. Hence we may not say that the neuter is=*τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους* (vers. 16, 18), *τοὺς δύο* (ver. 15), as KOPPE, MEYER and others think, nor does the neuter *ἕν* define the neuter *τὰ ἀμφότερα* (BENGEL). ["Both" is usually referred to "Jews and Gentiles." This is a legitimate inference, but Braune holds that the statement here does not require any specific reference.—R.]

And broke down the middle wall of the partition [*καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας*].—The indefinite notion of "making one" is now more closely defined; *καί* adds in a figure the main point; hence it is not epexegetical (MEYER). [The explanatory or epexegetical force of *καί* is accepted by EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT. It is correct, if the previous clause has a distinct reference to the Jews and Gentiles: who made both Jews and Gentiles one, *viz.*, in that He broke down, *etc.* There seems to be nothing gained by adopting Braune's view, while the other most obviously suggests itself.—R.]

Τὸ μεσότοιχον, *τοῦ φραγμοῦ* (like *ἕρκος ὀδόντων*)=the partition wall of the fence, that is, the partition wall which is in the fence, denoting in the figure of an independent object a quality and effect of the hedge. [So HARLESS]. The leading idea is found in the first noun, the wall set up between the two, the Gentiles without the promise and covenant of God, and the Jews, the people of promise, which contains in itself the notion of separation; the participle applies to it. Therefore *τοῦ φραγμοῦ* is not the genitive of apposition (MEYER) or to be resolved into *τὸν φραγμὸν τὸ μεσότοιχον ὄντα* (GRIMM, *Clavis, sub voce*); in that case we would have found here *τὸν φραγμὸν τοῦ μεσοτοίχου*. LUTHER too is incorrect: and has broken down the hedge, which was between. Nor is it=*μεσότοιχον διαφράσσον* (GROTIUS and others). Unserviceable here also is the distinction of BENGEL: *paries disjungit domos, sepes regiones.* From Matth. xxi. 33; Isa. v. 2, we are shown that *φραγμός* (in agreement with ver. 15) refers to the law, that is, to its quality or effect in separating the people of God, which permits it to be regarded as a partition wall. We may also refer it to the temple in which a type of the spiritual is presented, and to which the expressions here selected point; there was there a court of the Gentiles (Acts xxi. 28), though only in latter times, in the last temple; a vail, which separated like a wall, rent first at the death of the Redeemer. Hence the word *λύσας* is aptly chosen (John ii. 19; Matth. v. 17; Gal. ii. 18; 1 John iii. 8; 2 Pet. iii. 10).*—All reference to the separated residence of Jews in cities, as in Frankfort, Rome and elsewhere (GRONOW and others) and the like is to be rejected.

Ver. 15. **Having abolished (done away) in his flesh the enmity, even the law of the commandments expressed in ordinances** [*τὴν ἔχθραν, ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας*. See *Textual Note* [4]]. The Apostle now adds, without a connecting particle, the meaning of the figure; he construes it thus: *τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καταργήσας*, but during the dictation inserts after *αὐτοῦ* the phrase *τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν*, the banner of this enmity; these two objects in the accusative representing two sides of one object, hence very well allowing the dependence on *κατηργήσας*. To *τὸ μεσότοιχον* corresponds *τὴν ἔχθραν* denoting simply the literal reality, the division, the hostile separation and antagonism of Jews and Gentiles, and, since there is nothing to indicate any limitation, but as the context rather points to enmity of man towards God which is active behind this hostility of the Jews and Gentiles, including this latter at the same time (ver. 16). [So ALFORD and ELLI-

* [The strictly instrumental sense does not belong to *ἐν*, even here, where it seems so natural. At all events the idea of *immanent* instrumentality is as much as can be conceded in that direction. ALFORD rightly prefers "in" as more comprehensive: "The symbol of a fact *in* which—the seal of a covenant *in* which—your nearness to God consists." HODGE accepts "by" as the proper rendering without question.—R.]

† [This particle introduces a confirmatory explanation of the preceding verse (so most commentators).—R.]

* [EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT follow DE WETTE in taking *τοῦ φραγμοῦ* as the genitive of possession: the wall which pertained to, or belonged to the fence. This view has the advantage of giving a wider reference to *φραγμός*. ALFORD finds a primary allusion to the rending of the vail of the temple, a view which is supported by the complex idea of peace running through our passage. He takes *φραγμός* (of which *μεσότοιχον* is the instrument, as=the whole legal system, ceremonial and moral, which made the whole separation,—of Jew from Gentile,—and in the background of both from God. (So ELLICOTT.)—R.]

COTT: "The enmity due not only to Judaical limitations and antagonisms, but also and, as the widening context shows, more especially to the alienation of both Jew and Gentile from God."—R.] BUCER: *Vera tamen inter Judæos et ethnicos inimicitia, i. e., diversitas erat, quod illi verum Deum colerent, hi minime.* It is incorrect to refer it exclusively to the enmity against God (GREEK FATHERS, HARLESS and others) or to the enmity between the Jews and the Gentiles (AMBROSIASTER, ERASMUS, BLEEK [EADIE, HODGE] and others), or to understand only the cause of division that is the law (LUTHER, CALVIN and others). It is correct however to understand that the Apostle places by the side of the existing fact, τὴν ἔχθραν, the cause of the same, τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι.

The law has its contents in "commandments:" αἱ ἐντολαί, the injunctions to be regarded and executed, are both the purely moral and the ceremonial commandments of God (Matth. xv. 3; xxii. 36, 38; Rom. vii. 8–13), called also "of men" (Tit. i. 14); the plural marks plurality, and points also to divisions. This is rendered prominent by the phrase ἐν δόγμασιν, joined closely without the article to ἐντολῶν, and defining its quality. Similarly: πίστις ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ (i. 15), ἀγάπη ἐν πνεύματι (Col. i. 8), σοφία ἐν μυστηρίῳ (1 Cor. ii. 7). Comp. WINER, pp. 129, 206. Δόγμα, used of regal orders (Luke ii. 1; Acts xvii. 7), of apostolic determinations (Acts xvi. 4), means here as in Col. ii. 14 the statutes of the law; δογματίζεσθαι, in Col. ii. 20, is to be ordered or to order one's self. The idea of a mandate is always contained in it. ERASMUS: *Ostendens legem imperiosam appellat illam τῶν ἐντολῶν (ἐντέλλουσαν)—quomodo? non persuasione et lenitate aut promissis, sed præceptis quæ vocat* DOGMATA. Every ἐντολή appears then in a special, mandatory precept. [This view of the phrase is now the common one. ALFORD: "The law of decretory commandments." For the other interpretations, see HARLESS and EADIE *in loco*.—R.]

Of this there is predicated καταργήσας (ἀργὸν=ἀεργὸν ποιεῖν, Rom. iii. 31; 1 Cor. xiii. 11): to make unavailing, to do away, to deprive of power. The ideal worth remains intact, so also the theocratic obligation; but in so far as the law imperiously binds the heart and will with casuistic ordinances for all cases, it is done away. In this too lies the cause of the enmity against God and men. [EADIE takes "law," *etc.* to mean the ceremonial law. HODGE more correctly: "The idea probably is that the law in all its compass, and in all its forms, so far as it was a covenant prescribing the conditions of salvation, is abolished." He extends it to all the law of God, written in the heart as well, while admitting a special reference to the Mosaic law.—R.]

This doing away took place "in his flesh." As the decisive, main qualification it stands in an emphatic position. It means more than "in Himself," denoting the real "likeness" to our "flesh," in which He began His sanctifying, expiating sorrows, which slew what was opposed, which helped the right to full right, in active obedience to the law even to the acme, of the death on the cross, the passive obedience, thus, though without sin, bearing, feeling, overcoming the "enmity" with the "law," thus "by virtue of His fleshly life under the law, which He gave to death, in order to receive it back from death living, glorious, free in spirit for us all" (DELITZSCH), putting the law with its ordinances into inactivity, at the same time in His bodily life burying it. BENGEL construes incorrectly: *Est quasi stilo lapidari scriptum: Christus carne sua inimicitiam, dogmatibus evangelicis in totum orbem deditis legem præceptorum sustulit;* this is simply untrue historically, impossible logically, unnecessary grammatically, and too artificial. [It seems scarcely correct to render "*by* His flesh" (HODGE: "*i. e.*, by His death"), since this leaves out of view the life of Christ as a satisfaction of the law. Besides ἐν rarely means simply *by*. ALFORD and ELLICOTT however thus limit it: "in His *crucified* flesh."—The question of connection is more disputed. The article would precede, if it should be joined to ἔχθραν. HARLESS, DE WETTE, MEYER, EADIE, HODGE agree with Braune in joining it with καταργήσας, in emphatic position. To this ALFORD, who, with ELLICOTT and many of the earlier commentators, joins it with λύσας, objects, because it makes the instrumental predication precede the verb. If ἔχθραν is governed by καταργήσας, the question is decided at once, while in any case this view seems preferable; the general sense remaining the same, although the allusion to the vail of the temple becomes more prominent, if Alford's view be accepted.—R.]

MEYER and others take τὴν ἔχθραν by itself as in apposition to μεσότοιχον, detaching it from what follows; in that case τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν would stand before ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ. [This is also the view of EADIE, HODGE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT. While it does not introduce any *material* difference into the interpretation of the passage, it modifies its form very considerably. And it seems the preferable view. The objection Braune raises is met at once by saying that his own interpretation assumes an afterthought influencing the order (see beginning of this verse). The emphatic phrase: "in His flesh" thus takes an emphatic position, whatever be its connection. The emphasis is altogether lost in the E. V., as any reader may perceive. This view allows of a nicer discrimination between the accusatives, introduces a needed explanation of the figurative expression: "middle wall," while ἔχθραν is more usual after the verb λύειν than after καταργεῖν. HODGE thus paraphrases: "He is our peace, because He has made the two one, by removing the enmity or middle wall which divided the Jews and Gentiles, and this was done by abolishing the law." This is correct, but omits the important description of the law and the emphatic: in His flesh." Comp. *Textual Note* 4.—R.]

STIER incorrectly joins ἐν δόγμασιν to νόμον; but then the article τόν would necessarily have been prefixed (1 Thess. i. 8) or ἐντολῶν have preceded νόμον (Col. i. 8). Nor is "in his flesh" to be joined with "enmity" (CHRYSOSTOM), as though only a natural hatred among his people, among his kindred, were referred to. It is incorrect to understand νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν as referring only to *adiaphora* (GROTIUS), to the ceremonial law (BENGEL) [EADIE], or to the moral law

alone (Calovius), or *δόγματα* as referring to *philosophorum doctrinas* (Grotius), since the readers are not *homines triti in philosophorum Scriptis;* quite as little can the doctrine of Christ be denoted thereby (Bengel and others), or *nova præcepta* (Fritzsche). Finally *καταργήσας* does not point to the removal of the theocratic obligation (Schenkel).

That he might create the two in himself into one new man [*ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον*].—*Ἵνα* introduces a final clause, giving here the purpose of *καταργήσας*, which defines *λύσας* more closely, and with this explains *ποιήσας*. He has done away the law in its commandments; destroyed the separating elements clinging to it, that He might *κτίσῃ*. Thus the *ποιήσας* is further defined as creating. The objects of this creation, *τοὺς δύο*, are the two great masses of people regarded as two individualities, as two, not a greater number of separate individuals beside each other, each of whom stands or falls for himself (Olshausen); still less is there involved a series of various specimens of the different races. The masculine denotes the persons, in distinction from the more general idea of the neuter (*τὰ ἀμφότερα*, ver. 14); the choice of words corresponds. That *ἀνθρώπους* is not inserted, is not to be explained by the wider scope, as Bengel thinks: *eleganter omittit homines, antea enim vix humanum nomen tuiti erant.* *Ἐν ἑαυτῷ* places the Person of Christ again in the foreground: *Ne alibi quam in Christo unitatem quærant* (Calvin). [Hodge: "In virtue of union with Him,—union with Christ being the condition at once of their unity and of their holiness." In His Person, at all events.—R.] The ground of the existence and permanence is in Him; He is the Author (*κτίσῃ*) and foundation, and at the same time the life-sphere, Creator and Second Adam, Progenitor of the new race, which stands in original peace with God. It is therefore not =*δι' ἑαυτοῦ* (Greek Fathers), in order to exclude angels or other powers, as those through whom what is asserted was effected. But still less is it=*per suam doctrinam* (Grotius).

In this creation (*κτίσῃ*, vers. 1, 10) there is a purpose *εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον*. *Ἐν ἑαυτῷ* conditions *ἄνθρωπος* in the singular. Comp. Gal. iii. 28: *πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*; John x. 16. By *εἷς καινὸς ἄνθρωπος* is indicated: *ὁρᾷς οὐχὶ τὸν Ἕλληνα γενόμενον Ἰουδαῖον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτον κἀκεῖνον εἰς ἑτέραν κατάστασιν ἥκοντας οὐχ ἵνα τοῦτον ἕτερον ἐργάσηται, τὸν νόμον κατήργησεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ.* It is very superficial and perverted to take "one new man" as a third, which is neither heathenism nor Judaism, without thinking of the *moral* renewal of *persons* (Baumgarten-Crusius). The preposition marks the purpose or tendency, and thus the creation as one not yet concluded; humanity, consisting of personally free individuals, is potentially renewed in Christ, but not yet actually.

[Alford: "Observe, not that He might reconcile the two to *each other* only, nor is the Apostle speaking merely of any such reconciliation: but that He might incorporate the two, reconciled in Him to God, into one *new* man,—the old man to which both belonged, the enemy of God, having been slain in His flesh on the cross. Observe, too, *one* new man: we are all in God's sight, but one in Christ, as we are but one in Adam."—R.]

Hence: **So making peace,** *ποιῶν εἰρήνην*.—The present participle stands first for emphasis, marking a continued activity of Christ. The act of union does not therefore coincide with the act of creation. Hence Bucer is incorrect: *pace facta.* Since *εἰρήνη* has no limitation joined with it, that peace (between Jews and Gentiles) which the context indicates as the most immediate reference, is to be meant, but that which is implied also in "new man" (toward God) is not to be excluded (Schenkel [Eadie, Hodge], and others). Harless should not term the note of Chrysostom (*πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους*) correct only in the first half.

Ver. 16. **And might reconcile them both** [*Καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους*].—*Καί* connects this clause with *ἵνα*, on which the verb depends; so that this too belongs to the purpose of *καταργήσας*. The emphasis is on the verb which comes first. This compound occurs only here and in Col. i. 20, 21, and is a strengthened *καταλλάσσειν*, as *ἀπεκδέχεσθαι* and *ἀποκαραδοκεῖν*, not merely to expect, but to await, to expect with perseverance. The preposition *ἀπό* has the meaning "again" in composition (see Passow *sub voce*), but only when the notion of the verb itself includes this in some measure, as *ἀποκαθίστημι* of what is healed, restored (Matth. xii. 13; Mark iii. 5; viii. 25; Luke vi. 10; Acts i. 6); certainly the notion "again" is near at hand in that of reconciliation, because separation and enmity are not original, and the reconciliation leads away from the present status back to the original one. Hence the strengthened notion is "reconcile again." [So Calvin, Alford, Ellicott; but Eadie and Meyer object.—R.] *Qui ita deposuerunt immicitiam, ut amicitia successerit, neque quidquam reliquum sit, quin concordes vivant ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι, cujus est unum caput Christus* (Tittmann, *Syn.* I. p. 105).*—The *object* of the reconciliation: *τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους.* [The article renders the object definite: *them both* or *both of us.*—R.] Since Paul does not say *δύο*, which is a mere numeral, but *ἀμφότεροι*, which denotes diversity, he renders prominent the difficulty and importance of the reconciliation.

In one body to God through the cross [*ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ*].—"In one body" denotes the sphere in which the reconciliation is consummated: over against "both" there is now only "one body," in which they are; each does not need a separate one. To supply "being," *ὄντας*, in thought is the simplest interpretation. The phrase refers,

* [Against Tittmann's distinction, according to which *διαλάσσω* refers to the cessation of mutual enmity, and *καταλάσσω* is employed in cases where the enmity has existed only on one side, see Eadie; comp. Usteri, *Lehrbegriff*, p. 102; Fritzsche, *Romans*, I. p. 276; Tholuck, *Bergpredigt.* p. 192; Trench. *Syn. N. T.*, 2d part, p. 137; and especially the notes of Drs. Lange and Schaff, *Romans*, p. 166 f., and 2 *Corinthians*, p. 98 f. We must hold fast here: That the reconciliation is with God, that the ground of it is what Christ did on and through His cross, viz., removed from us the Divine wrath against sin, of which we were the objects in consequence of sin.—R.]

like *ἐν ἑαυτῷ*, *ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ*, *αὐτὸς γάρ* (ver. 14), to His Person, as the only one in which both are redeemed, to an organism (*σῶμα*, not *σάρξ*) in its outward appearance, thus to the body of Christ, the Church. [So HODGE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT.] It is not, *sicut Latinis collegia vocantur corpora*, corporation=Society (GROTIUS).

The end of the reconciliation is *τῷ θεῷ*. It is not God that is reconciled with men,* but men with God. What has all along been implied, conceived of in general, left indefinite in the words "peace" (vers. 14, 15), "the enmity" (ver. 15), "new man" (ver. 15), is now definitely expressed as the other side. The added qualification of the reconciliation: "through the [or His] cross" refers to the death on the cross, in which the *ἱλασμός*, the *atonement*, is marked as the act, which is the condition of the at-onement. Comp. *Doctr. Note* 3.

Hence it is not justifiable to take *ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι* as=*εἰς ἓν σῶμα* (DELITZSCH), or to refer it to the body of Christ on the cross (CHRYSOSTOM, BENGEL: *cruci affixo*, HARLESS, HOFMANN and others), since then *διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ* would be altogether unnecessary or should be joined with the following *ἀποκτείνας* (HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, II. 1, p. 381); nor is the thought to be completed thus: Christ has reconciled in one single body, or made one single body (His own) to a unity, including them in the same fellowship with God; there is no reference to the antithesis of *many* sacrifices before and outside of Christ. GROTIUS interprets *διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ* incorrectly: *Simul intelligit doctrinam cruce sanctam; sed crucem dicere maluit, ut intelligamus, quanto res ista Christo steterit*; STIER too misinterprets: the power and fear of the cross which is to be preached. Nor can we accept a reconciliation of "both" with each other, taking "to God" as dative *commodi: ut Deo serviant* (GROTIUS).

Having slain the enmity on it [*ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ*].—The aorist participle defines the mode of consummating the reconciliation, explaining *τοῦ σταυροῦ*, on which account *ἐν αὐτῷ* can refer only to this: the Crucified One, who was slain, the Dying One, slays and has slain "the enmity," which includes here as in ver. 15 both the enmity between "both" and against God, the latter being more prominent here, the former in ver. 15. On the cross the chief matter was, that He who had been rejected by both Jews and Gentiles should through a propitiation in Himself reconcile both to God. It is incorrect to exclude from *τὴν ἔχθραν* enmity toward God (SCHENKEL, MEYER) or of the Jews and Gentiles against each other (RUECKERT, HARLESS, HOFMANN), for the peace of these with each other does not condition their peace with God, indeed enmity against God participates in the hate these have toward each other, which the law occasions and furthers. [ALFORD and ELLICOTT adopt this wide or complex reference. HODGE however says: "The enmity is that which subsisted between God and man." Many doubt the propriety of predicating *ἔχθραν* of God, who certainly has *ὀργήν*. Comp. *Romans*, p. 165. In the passage there commented on, the active sense of the adjective must be accepted, I think, but that does not seem so bold and harsh as to say that *ἔχθραν* is "God's enmity." The wider reference is better sustained by the context, and of itself tones down the objectionable form without at all interfering with the implied truth respecting God's anger against sin and the satisfaction rendered on the cross.—The view of MEYER is accepted by EADIE, though there seems to be a confusion in his language. But this limited meaning does not "at all satisfy the solemnity of the sentence, or of the next two verses." Enmity here is "that between man and God, which Christ did slay on the cross, and which being brought to an end, the separation between Jew and Gentile, which was the result of it, was done away" (ALFORD). The fact that our participle is aorist, and in all probability denotes an antecedent act, is no objection to this view, as EADIE seems to think, since what Christ did on the cross (here spoken of) necessarily precedes what He designs doing through His cross ("reconcile them both in one body to God"), and the enmity of man against God was as fully and effectually destroyed in that act as that between Jew and Gentile. MEYER's position takes this distinction of enmity as the basis of the "one body," in which both are reconciled to God, but this seems to condition the latter on the former.—R.] It is a perversion to understand *τὴν ἔχθραν* as the law (KOPPE and others). Comp. on ver. 14. *Ἐν αὐτῷ* cannot be referred to *ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι* (BENGEL, HOFMANN).

Ver. 17. **And he came and preached peace** [*καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην*].—Since the verb is not dependent upon *ἵνα*, but independent, it cannot be joined with ver. 16. *Καί* connects rather with ver. 14: He Himself is our Peace and announces that Himself (HARLESS). What intervenes explains the former statement, by showing its meaning and truth in His doings even unto death: He has established peace, therefore He is our Peace. This is to be regarded as pre-supposed in *ἐλθών*. Accordingly His coming is after His resurrection. BENGEL is excellent: *Veniens a morte, profectione ad inferos, resurrectione, victor lætus ipse ultro nuntiavit.* To this the verb *εὐηγγελίσατο*, "preached," refers, which is not a predicting of the future, but a message from one who is present, who has come. *Ἐλθών* is added descriptively, and is in accordance with the promise (John xiv. 18): "I come to you," denoting there His continued presence, *insigne verbum* (BENGEL). CHRYSOSTOM well says: *οὐ δι' ἑτέρου ἔπεμψεν, οὐδὲ δι' ἄλλου τινὸς ταῦτα ἐμήνυσεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς δι' ἑαυτοῦ.* The Risen One is Himself an actual announcement of the attained victory and peace; He is present in the coming of the Holy Ghost, and also with His messengers and their gospel. So in 2 Tim. i. 10, where the *ἐπιφάνεια* of the Risen One and His gospel are spoken of.

Thus the proffering and appropriating of the

* [Inasmuch as "the cross" is here spoken of, we must admit a secondary reference to the propitiary sacrifice of Christ as the condition or ground of the reconciliation. If then we ask respecting the *nexus* between this ground and the result, there must enter a thought of God's wrath (ver. 3) against sin. One thing remains clear—whatever was objectively necessary that men might be at peace with God and with each other was effected by the death of Christ, and what is necessary in the subject is, to take hold of Christ by faith, as to be "in Him" (ver. 15) a member of the "one body" (ver. 16). —R.]

established peace is emphasized, and "preaching peace" is distinguished from "being peace." Evidently we should understand both peace with one another and with God. Accordingly it is incorrect to regard ἐλθών as redundant (GROTIUS and others), or to refer it to the Incarnation (CHRYSOSTOM, ANSELM, HARLESS); the expression can by no means be referred merely to the resurrection and the salutation of peace (BENGEL), or to the coming in the Holy Spirit (OLSHAUSEN, SCHENKEL), or in the Apostles (AMBROSE, CALVIN and others); nor can it be= caused to be proclaimed (GROTIUS), since ἐλθών is found here and is not redundant. "Peace" shou'd not be limited to the relation to God (CHRYSOSTOM, HARLESS [HODGE]) or of the Jews and Gentiles toward each other (BLEEK, MEYER). [The repetition and emphasis are against this.] As regards the matters here treated of, we should not compare here John x. 16; xii. 20–23; Matth. viii. 11; xxiv. 14, as though this were that which He "came and preached." We should rather be reminded of the renewal of the Apostles, the conversion of Paul, and of Rom. viii. 9, 10; 14-17; xv. 18; 2 Cor. xiii. 3, 5; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. i. 13. [So EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT (and HODGE, except as regards the comprehensive sense of "peace").—R.] The tense of the verb εὐηγγελίσατο defines the point of time of the conversion of individuals; then Christ brought it to them.

To you who were afar off and peace to those who were nigh, *ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς.*—This is to be taken in accordance with ver. 13. The readers as originally Gentiles are those "afar off," and on this account they come first, as indeed historically such were converted to the Church, the Jews, "those nigh," falling into the background. The repetition of εἰρήνην before this last term marks their need of this, notwithstanding their nearness; ὑμῖν however comprises both, since both (Jews and Gentiles) were in the Church, though the latter constituted the main element.* Comp. Acts xvi. 23. The double εἰρήνην is derived from Isa. lvii. 19. There שָׁלוֹם שָׁלוֹם refers not inaptly but emphatically, like the double *ναὶ ναί, οὒ οὔ* (Matth. v. 37; Jas. v. 12), to Gentiles and Jews, and hence the repetition. The dative depends on the verb, not on εἰρήνη as dative *commodi;* the interpretation of HARLESS compelling him to accept this view of it: the purport of His message was a peace which respected all, Jews as well as Gentiles. [So HODGE, but the other is far simpler, and accepted by MEYER, EADIE, ALFORD, and most.—R.]

Ver. 18. **For through him** [*ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ*].—Ὅτι is here evidently=*quia;* it is *probatio ab effectu* (CALVIN).* The purport of the εὐηγγελίσατο cannot be thus introduced (KOPPE); this is set forth in "peace," and it cannot be preached, that (ὅτι) we have, but only: because we have, or: that we may have. The nature of the "peace" is not to be explained by this clause (RUECKERT); this has been already defined. The truth of the assertion: "came and preached" is shown in a reality (ἔχομεν), the reality of the result of this preaching (τὴν προσαγωγήν); because the preaching of *Christ* is spoken of, δι' αὐτοῦ stands first. Were the proclamation the main matter, then ἔχομεν would have taken the first place. "Through Him" denotes the mediation by means of the entire Divine-human Person; it is not="through his blood" (OLSHAUSEN). [HODGE suggests this, but not to the exclusion of other thoughts. —R.]

We both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father [*ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*].—Προσαγωγή here, iii. 12 and Rom. v. 2 (εἰς χάριν) is the presupposition to the entrance into the holiest (Heb. x. 19) and "into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord" (2 Pet. i. 11) and the occasion of the drawing near (Heb. x. 22); it is not merely the right and permission to do so, but a fact in which we rejoice as a reality (1 Pet. iii. 18) that has become ours (ἔχομεν); the drawing near should not be wanting; ἐσχήκαμεν (Rom. v. 2) gives prominence to the appropriation as a continuing fact, ἔχομεν denotes only the present possession, the acceptance which has taken place. The underlying figure is according to Heb. x. 19-22 the entrance into the most holy place. In προσαγωγή STIER finds indicated a free approach and an ever closer approach. [The active, transitive sense: *admission, introduction,* is preferred by ELLICOTT, EADIE, and HODGE apparently, following THOLUCK (Romans v. 2), while ALFORD prefers the intransitive sense, *access,* which does not differ greatly from the other, certainly does mean merely liberty of approach, and leave the actual enjoyment of the privilege out of view. "Introduction" certainly does not bring out the idea of "repetition, present liberty of approach," as "access" does.—MEYER and EADIE remark that it means more than "door," John x. 9. Comp. *Romans,* pp. 160, 161.—R.] We need not with CHRYSOSTOM (*οὐκ εἶπεν πρόσοδον· οὐ γὰρ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ προσήλθομεν, ἀλλ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ προσήχθημεν*) and MEYER think of a προσαγωγεύς to the king. [This thought need not be peremptorily rejected, however, though the other is on the whole preferable (ELLICOTT, EADIE, ALFORD).—R.]. The notion of "leading into" [MEYER] does not suit the other passages, iii. 12; Rom. v. 2.

The words: *οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι* placed in juxtaposition, mark strongly the removed division, the unity, that too in the fellow-

* [This seems doubtful in view of the repeated εἰρήνην, which interposes between ὑμῖν and τοῖς ἐγγύς. ALFORD is better: "Not '*to us*' (*i. e.*, in the second category), for fear of still upholding the distinction where he wishes to merge it altogether."—"Though those 'who were nigh' were the first who heard the proclamation based on the commission—'beginning at Jerusalem,' yet those 'who were afar off' are mentioned first, as they had so deep an interest in the tidings, and as the invitation of Gentiles into the Church—a theme the Apostle delighted in, proving, as it did, the abolition of class privileges, and the commencement of an unrestricted economy—was the result and proof of the truths illustrated in this paragraph."—R.]

* [ELLICOTT says correctly that the particle is not merely explanatory, nor yet strongly causal, 'because we have," but with more of a demonstrative or confirmatory force, "as it is a fact that we have."—ALFORD finds in this verse a proof of the wide reference of the words "peace" and "reconcile" in the previous verses. "Here clearly the union (not reconciliation, nor is enmity predicted of them) of Jew and Gentile is subordinated to the blessed fact of an access to God having been provided for both through Christ by the Spirit."—R.]

ship of the Holy Spirit. They are not merely within the body of Christ, members of the Church, but are animated and impelled by the Spirit ruling there, which He has sent. "In one Spirit" refers to "in one body;" the two expressions being parallel. It is certainly not = *unanimis voluntate*, *ὁμοθυμαδόν* (ANSELM). [The reference to the Holy Spirit scarcely admits of a reasonable doubt. But the preposition is not instrumental. To take as such destroys the parallelism with "in one body," and confuses the relations of this clause. It is greatly to be regretted that this verse, so explicit and discriminating in its designations of the work of the Trinity in our salvation, should be thus confused. Dr. HODGE, whose notes on this verse are otherwise so excellent, does not bring out fully the correct interpretation of this preposition. "The Holy Spirit is, as it were, the vital sphere or element in which both parties have their common *προσαγωγή* to the Father" (ELLICOTT).—R.] "Unto the Father," *ad Patrem ut ad Patrem. Hoc versu fit mentio Christi, Spiritus, Patris, eodem ordine, quo* ver. 12, 1 Cor. i. 3, 5; *aliter* Acts i. 4, 5 (BENGEL). The choice of prepositions is remarkably apt: *π ρ ὸ ς τὸν πατέρα δ ι ὰ Χριστοῦ ε ν πνεύματι*, *Unto* the Father *through* Christ *in* the Spirit.

Sketch of their present condition. Vers. 19-22.

Ver. 19. **So then ye are no longer** [*ἄ ρ α ο ὖ ν ο ὐ κ έ τ ι ἐ σ τ έ*].—*Ἄ ρ α ο ὖ ν* is very often used by Paul (Rom. v. 18; vii. 3; viii. 12, *etc.* WINER, pp. 414, 519); it is = *hinc ergo* [accordingly then, comp. on Gal. vi. 10.—R.]; *ἄ ρ α* draws a conclusion from vers. 14-18; *ο ὖ ν* continues the discourse. *Ο ὐ κ έ τ ι*, "no longer," is placed immediately after *ἄ ρ α ο ὖ ν*, for the sake of emphasis.

Strangers and sojourners, *ξ έ ν ο ι κ α ὶ π ά ρ ο ι κ ο ι*.—LUTHER's rendering: *Gäste und Freundlinge*, unnecessarily transposes the words. The expression proceeds from the more remote, *ξένοι*, to the less remote, *π ά ρ ο ι κ ο ι*. The former is the antithesis of *ἐπιχώριος*, and thus of the following *συνπολῖται*. So "brethren" are termed (3 John 5*) "strangers;" it is = גֵּר. The latter word, *π ά ρ ο ι κ ο ι* = תּוֹשָׁב, which is often joined with the former (Lev. xxv. 35, 40). Lev. xxii. 10, 11, where the LXX oppose *πάροικος ἱερέως* and *οἰκογενεῖς αὐτου*, forbidding the former and permitting the latter to eat of the holy things, seems to have been in the Apostle's mind. *Π ά ρ ο ι κ ο ι* is then here the opposite of *οικεῖοι*, and means *inquilini* (from *incolo*, *incolinus*), *qui domicilium in aliquo loco habent sine jure civitatis, hospites in urbe aliqua* (GROTIUS). The frequent figurative descriptions of the kingdom of God as the city or house of God (1 Tim. iii. 15: Gal. iv. 26 and Heb. iii. 6; xii. 22) here evidently pass over into each other (*συνπολῖται—οἰκεῖοι*); there is not however a union or a mixing of these figures, but the *πολιτεία* is regarded as a more extended household. It inheres in the matter itself, that the citizens of the kingdom of God, have now filial and household privileges with Him, His whole people become themselves the holy house, the temple in which His Spirit dwells (HARLESS, STIER). The figure of the house and building predominates (vers. 20-22). We should not think of proselytes (STIER), nor take *ξ έ ν ο ι κ α ὶ π ά ρ ο ι κ ο ι* as the antithesis to *συνπολῖται τῶν ἁγίων*, which is enhanced in meaning by *οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ* (MEYER). [The plausible parallelism of HARLESS and BENGEL, adopted by Braune, is doubted by ALFORD and ELLICOTT, but accepted by EADIE.—R.]

But ye are.—The repetition of *ἐ σ τ έ*, in accordance with the best authorities (see *Textual Note* 9), is emphatic, like Rom. viii. 15; 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7; Heb. xii. 18, 22.

Fellow-citizens with the saints [*σ υ ν π ο λ ῖ τ α ι** *τ ῶ ν ἁ γ ί ω ν*].—Among "the saints" we can include only those who have been thus termed from the beginning of the Epistle, Christians. BENGEL (*Israelis cfr.* iii. 18), STIER, BLEEK, and others, have taken occasion from ver. 12 to refer it to the spiritual Israel; but this word being without closer qualification scarcely admits of this. RUECKERT understands the Jewish Christians alone under the term. Still less are we to think of the patriarchs (CHRYSOSTOM), or the angels (CALVIN, and others), or to include them here. Still the notion should be extended as it has been by ZANCHIUS: *omnium vere sanctorum, qui unquam fuerunt futurive sunt.* [So EADIE. ALFORD: "Not *angels*, nor *Jews*, nor *Christians then alive* merely, but the saints of God in the widest sense, all the members of the mystical body of Christ, the commonwealth of the spiritual Israel." ELLICOTT: "The members of that spiritual community in which Jew and Gentile Christians were now united and incorporated, and to which the external theocracy formed a typical and preparatory institution." This view, which is that of MEYER, HODGE and many others, is preferable, notwithstanding the objection of Braune, since ver. 13 could not fail to remain in the Apostle's mind.—R.]

And of the household of God, *ο ἰ κ ε ῖ ο ι τ ο ῦ θ ε ο ῦ*.—This means those who belong to the house, to the family, whose Head and Father is God. To the right of citizen is added that of the house, of the child, of the heir, ye are not merely menials, servants, but members of the family, children. They have a relation of fellowship not merely to "the saints," but to "God" also. *Οἰκεῖος* by itself would mean only *domesticus*, one who dwelt in the same house, as 1 Tim. v. 8, and as *οἰκιακός*, Matt. x. 36, so that it would remain undecided in what precise relation he stood. The genitive *τ ο ῦ θ ε ο ῦ*, "of God," in accordance with *συνπολῖται τῶν ἁγίων*, obliges us to apply it to the most intimate relation, that of a child. It is incorrect to understand, according to Gal. vi. 10: *οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως*, *religionis socii* (WINER, who compares *οἰκεῖοι φιλοσοφίας*, *philosophiæ addicti*), here *familiares*,

* [The E. V. makes an antithesis in this passage which the original does not at all warrant; "to brethren, and that strangers," is the literal rendering.—R.]

* [The word would ordinarily be spelled *συμπολῖται*, but ℵ. A. B.[1] C. D. E. F. G. support *σ υ ν π ο λ ῖ τ α ι*, which is adopted by Tischendorf and most later editors and commentators (MEYER studiously retains the other orthography).—The word belongs to later Greek, and is considered rather inelegant. ALFORD says the compound verb is found in the purest Attic writers, and the noun in Euripides, *Herac.* 826. Certainly the compound is necessary to express the Apostle's meaning, even though it belong in itself to the *fatiscens Græcitas*.—R.]

intimate friends (THEODORET: *προσοικειωθέντες*, relatives); quite as little should we take the family here as the stones of the house in which God dwells (HARLESS), even though the next verse passes to that figure.

Ver. 20. **Built up upon the foundation,** *ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ*.—The participle characterizes the *οἰκεῖοι* as members, who are themselves first wrought, and inserted in the whole as "living stones" (1 Pet. ii. 5), and that too upon the foundation which is laid. *Vulgate* and BENGEL: *superædificate.* [We have the noun *super-structure*, but not a corresponding verb. The phrase "built up" is the nearest equivalent. "Having been built up" has perhaps too strict a reference to the past act. — R.] The aorist denotes the act of *being* built upon, and the context refers only to what has already been attained, not to the further building, which is emphasized in 1 Cor. iii. 10, but first mentioned here in ver. 22. Hence we have here *ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ*, not: *ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον* (Rom. xv. 20), nor yet: *ἐπὶ τοῦ θεμελίου* (= from the foundation, over the foundation; see WINER, p. 350), which would point to the further building. The dative here is not then "accidental" (MEYER). [ELLICOTT remarks on the assertion of Meyer, that the dative of rest, instead of the genitive of rest, is accidental: "the former denotes absolute and less separable, the latter partial and more separable super-position." The apparent exception (i. 10: *ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*) is a reading of doubtful authority. —R.)

There is here no leap from one figure (that of the family) to another (that of a building); it is only on the other side of the same figure, which has in the temple its deeper or higher unity. Comp. Numb. xii. 7; Heb. iii. 2-6; 1 Tim. iii. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 19-21: 1 Cor. iii. 9, 10; Col. ii. 7; Jude 20; Acts xx. 32. [If there be a transition it is quite easy and natural, "the employment of a term in a double meaning. 'House' has a similar twofold signification with us, as the 'house of Bourbon," or 'house of Stuart,'—phrases in which the word is employed in a secondary and emphatic signification. We speak too of such houses being 'built up' by the wisdom or valor of their founders. In such cases, as Alford says, there is a transition from a political and social to a material image" (EADIE).—R.] Whether *θεμέλιος* is masculine, as in 1 Cor. iii. 10, 11, 12; 2 Tim. ii. 19; Heb. xi. 10; Acts xxi. 14, 19, or neuter, as in Acts xvi. 26, can be determined as little from the text as Rom. xv. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 19; nor can it be decided on the ground that the neuter is used only metaphorically, which would be inadmissible here (HARLESS), but rather from the fact that the masculine seems to be the prevalent usage with Paul.

Of the apostles and prophets, *τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν*.—These genitives set forth who has laid the foundation; 1 Cor. iii. 10: *θεμέλιον ἔθηκα*; Rom. xv. 20: *ἐπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ*. For: *testimonium apostolorum et prophetarum substrictum est fidei credentium omnium; per illos jactum est fundamentum* (BENGEL). Comp. iii. 5, 6, 7. It is not then a genitive of apposition, which would designate the Apostles and Prophets as the foundation (CHRYSOSTOM, A-LAPIDE, ESTIUS, [BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS, OLSHAUSEN, DE WETTE, HODGE], and others), for Christ is not *primus inter pares* (1 Cor. i. 12, 13; iii. 11) and Rev. xxi. 14 is a vision, in which the name of Christ is not mentioned, and the names of the Apostles are only inscribed on the foundations. Nor is it a possessive genitive (ANSELM, BEZA, [BUCER, COCCEIUS, ALFORD], and others), for Christ can at least not be the foundation, where He is represented as the corner-stone.

[This view may be now considered the usual one. It is adopted by BULLINGER, CALVIN, CALIXTUS, GROTIUS, BENGEL, KOPPE, FLATT, RUECKERT, HARLESS, HOLZHAUSEN, BLEEK, MEYER, EADIE, ELLICOTT, SCHENKEL. This takes the genitive as that of "originating cause." The only possible objection to it is that urged by ALFORD against the introduction of those who form parts of the building as agents; but on this very foundation they rested even if they laid it. To take the genitive as *appositional* is grammatical enough, and does not necessarily involve doctrinal difficulties, while it avoids confusing the foundation and the corner-stone, as the possessive sense does; but the whole analogy of Scripture figures seems to be against it. The simplest, least embarrassed view is then: "The doctrine of the Apostles, *i. e.* Christ *preached*, is the *θεμέλιος*; Christ *personal* the *ἀκρογωνιαῖος*; Christ mystical the *πλήρωμα*" (ELLICOTT). This view elevates evangelical preaching, while it sends us back of councils and creeds to Christ for our doctrine.—R.]

The context, which admits only of the preaching of the Christ already come, the order of the words and the omission of the article before *προφητῶν*, thus denoting a single category, compel us to think chiefly of the Apostles alone (HARLESS, STIER, HOFMANN, II. 2, p. 103),—who are prophets also (iii. 11): the first term referring more to their personal testimony respecting what they have seen and heard, the latter more to the testimony communicated through the Spirit,—and not to the Old Testament prophets (GREEK FATHERS, JEROME, ERASMUS, CALVIN, CALOVIUS, RUECKERT, [BARNES], and others), or to the New Testament prophets, subordinate to the Apostles (PELAGIUS, BENGEL: *qui apostolis sunt proximi*, KOPPE, MEYER, SCHENKEL, BLEEK). [The reasons for a reference to New Testament prophets seem far more decisive than those which support the identity of Apostles and prophets in this passage. The absence of the article is not conclusive. So EADIE, HODGE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT. The reference to the Old Testament prophets is untenable; comp. EADIE and ALFORD *in loco*.—R.] Of Montanism with its continuation of the Apostolate by means of prophets, ZELLER and his teacher BAUR alone can think. On the significance of the view here set forth, see *Doctr. Note* 6.

Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner-stone [*ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*. See *Textual* Note [10]].—*Participium ὄντος initio commatis hujus, valde demonstrat in præsenti tempore* (BENGEL), and marks the *being so.* *Ἀκρογωνιαῖον*, to which some codices add *λίθον*, occurs only here and 1 Pet.

ii. 6: λίθον ἀκρογωνιαῖον, from Isa. xxviii. 16; comp. Matt. xxi. 42: λίθος—ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας. *Lapis angularis, ut duos parietes ipse medius contineret* (JEROME) καὶ τοὺς τοίχους συνέχει καὶ τοὺς θεμελίους (CHRYSOSTOM), is the stone, which upholds the connection of the single ones with the whole, gives support to the whole edifice, is the most important stone, designating here the importance and indispensableness of Christ above the Apostles, just as in 1 Cor. iii. 11 Christ is termed the foundation, and the Apostles those who have in preaching laid this foundation and built others upon it. The foundation on which the Ephesians have been built is the preaching of the Apostles, but Christ is the corner-stone, who gives support to the whole and to the parts, Christ Himself, the living historical Christ. It must not be supposed that the Apostles personally are a foundation; they themselves need the corner-stone and are also built upon it. The various readings (see *Textual Note* [10]) do not alter the sense, only αὐτοῦ marks somewhat more strongly the Person of Christ, and τοῦ in ℵ., or Ἰησοῦ in the others the historical Christ. Αὐτοῦ is not to be referred to θεμελίῳ (BENGEL and others). The article is naturally wanting after αὐτοῦ, since no reference to what precedes is intended; the "corner-stone" is not for the "foundation;" that would be the support of the foundation; the support of the edifice is spoken of. A reference to the union of Jewish and Gentile Christians (THEODORET, ESTIUS and others) is too remote according to the context, ver. 19: "ye no longer are."

Ver. 21. **In whom,** ἐν ᾧ.—This is to be referred then to the Person of Christ, not to "corner-stone" (ESTIUS, KOPPE and others), or "foundation" (HOLZHAUSEN), ἐφ' ᾧ or ἐφ' οὗ the building might be raised. It is not then: above which (BEZA: *Super*), nor: on which (LUTHER), nor yet: through whom (FLATT: *per*), but like i. 10: ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, who is the point of union and support of the framing together and growing, without which the building falls, dissolves, and does not grow (RUECKERT, HARLESS, STIER), [ALFORD, HODGE, EADIE and most.—R.]

All the building, πᾶσα οἰκοδομή.—Although πᾶσα ἡ οἰκοδομή is the least sustained reading, and the article should be rejected, and the use of πᾶς with and without the article according to Rom. iii. 9 (πᾶν στόμα—πᾶς ὁ κόσμος) is such that the former would mean; the *whole* building and the latter: *every* building, yet here we must in accordance with the context interpret: the *whole* building, as πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραηλ (Acts ii. 36), which however can be regarded as a proper name not requiring the article see WINER, p. 106. ŒKUMENIUS reads πᾶσα οἰκοδομή and explains: ἡ καθόλου ἐκκλησια. IGNATIUS uses πᾶσα ἐπιστολή, πᾶσα ἐκκλησία in the sense of the whole letter, the whole church. The later Greek usage justifies this explanation and the omission of the article.

[Those commentators who are unwilling to accept the poorly supported reading of the *Rec.*, as a rule take refuge from the incongruous interpretation; every building, which usage favors, in some such explanation as Braune gives. MEYER, whose grammatical accuracy rarely leads him astray, in this case insists on a strict interpretation. ALFORD: "Are we then to render ungrammatically, and force words to that which they cannot mean? Certainly not"—"the account to be given of such later usages is, that gradually other words besides proper names became regarded as able to dispense with the article after πᾶς, so that as they said first πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα (Matth. ii. 23), and then πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραήλ (Acts ii. 36), so they came at length to say πᾶσα κτίσις (as we ourselves, 'all creation' for 'all *the* creation') and πᾶσα οἰκοδομή, when speaking of one universal and notorious building." ELLICOTT accepts this view, but doubts the existence of another distinct instance in the New Testament. EADIE thinks the passages cited above and Luke iv. 13; Acts vii. 22; Col. i. 15, at least show a transition to a larger usage. MEYER's grammatical haste leads him into an unwarranted exegesis, for what warrant is there for calling separate congregations οἰκοδομη.—R.]

Οἰκοδομή is like 1 Cor. iii. 9, *building*, the edifice in the process of erection, which grows into a temple, especially as ver. 22: συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον, marks decidedly the process, requiring the substantive idea of this verse to be that of a building going up. [Hence our word is chosen, not οἶκος.—R.] Our verse then contains an entirely general thought, which ver. 22 applies to the Ephesian church, in the figure of a temple, of the Church as one whole on one foundation; the view that every Christian is a temple of the Holy Ghost (2 Cor. vi. 16), and every congregation also such an one, being quite remote. Hence it does not mean: *every* building (MEYER), nor "every part of the building," walls, roof, *etc.* (CHRYSOSTOM), since it is not these parts, but the building as a whole that grows into a temple. [Comp. however EADIE *in loco*.—R.]

Fitly framed together is growing [συναρμολογουμένη αὔξει].—The present αὔξει, instead of αὐξάνεται, like αὔξῃ (Col. ii. 19), is rare but classical, denoting together with the present participle the process, which the Apostle considers merely as a spectator; the participle sets forth the form of the growth. Συναρμολογεῖν from ἁρμός, groove, joint, member (*armus, artus*), as Heb. iv. 12, occurs only here and in iv. 16, and according to this and the parallel passage Col. ii. 19 is = framed together, incorporated together. The figure is derived from the organism of the body.—Αὐξάνειν (sometimes transitive = *augere*, as in 1 Cor. iii. 6, 7; 2 Cor. ix. 10, but usually intransitive) is used most exactly of plants (Matth. vi. 28; xiii. 32), but of men also (Luke i. 80; ii. 40; 1 Pet. ii. 2), of a nation (Acts vii. 17), of the word of God (Acts vi. 7; xix. 20), of faith (2 Cor. x. 15), of growth in grace (2 Pet. iii. 18: comp. Col. i. 10); John the Baptist uses it in a purely external sense of Christ (Jno. iii. 30: δεῖ αὐξάνειν). The growth is not then merely an outward extension, but respects the number of the called and their progress toward perfection (NITZSCH). Hence GROTIUS is incorrect: *quorum jam mœnia surgunt;* the citizens themselves are largely involved. BENGEL: *crescit coagmentata, Vulgate: constructa,* but these renderings are insufficient.

[ALFORD: "Both participle and verb imply

that the fitting together and the growing are still going on: and the only way which we in English have to mark this so as to avoid the chance of mistake, is by the auxiliary verb substantive, and the participle. The bare present, 'growth,' is in danger of being mistaken for the abstract quality, and the temporal development is thus lost sight of: whereas the other, in giving prominence to that temporal development, also necessarily implies the 'normal, perpetual unconditioned nature of the organic increase' (ELLICOTT)."—R.]

Unto a holy temple, *εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον.*—The goal of the growth is set forth in the figure of the temple in Zion. It is mere playing with the text to refer it to the temple of Diana, which *cedere debet* (BENGEL) to this. [MEYER remarks: "This is not to be translated: unto *a* holy temple; for the notion of *several* temples was foreign to the Apostle in consequence of the Jewish national peculiarity, but: unto *the* holy temple, which does not require the article." This accords with the extensive reference advocated above.—R.]

In the Lord, *ἐν κυρίῳ.*—This phrase is to be joined with "holy," characterizing the sacredness of their temple as inward, vital, proceeding from, effected and nourished by Him.—[So HARLESS, USTERI, DE WETTE, HOFMANN, BLEEK.—R.] Unquestionably Christ is meant, as the Apostolic *usus loquendi* (WINER, p. 118) and the context which refers back to *ἐν ᾧ*, demand; He is the Mediator, in whom the members become *οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ*. Hence *ἐν κυρίῳ* is not to be taken as the simple dative (BEZA, KOPPE [MACKNIGHT] and others), or joined with *ναόν = κυρίου, i. e., Dei* (BENGEL). Others rightly refer it to Christ, but incorrectly join it with *ναὸν ἅγιον* as one notion (STIER), or with *αὔξει* (MEYER), in spite of *ἐν ᾧ*. [The construction last named is rendered still more objectionable by taking *ἐν* = "through" (GROTIUS, WOLF, and SCHENKEL, who has a fondness for this instrumental sense of the proposition). HODGE suggests the same view, but prefers that of MEYER, which is tautological. ELLICOTT objects to the connection with *ἅγιον*, that it "gives perhaps a greater prominence to the special nature of the holiness than the context requires." He therefore prefers the view of STIER, taking the phrase as a kind of tertiary predicate, almost = "and it is a holy temple in the Lord, and in Him alone." ALFORD thinks this more in accordance with the Apostle's style, and it is favored by *ἐν πνεύματι*, ver. 22. So EADIE.—R.]

Ver. 22. **In whom ye also** [*ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς*].—*Per anaphoram iteratur ἐν ᾧ* (BENGEL), which is to be joined to "Christ Jesus Himself," as i. 13. It is not to be connected with *κυρίῳ* (HARLESS, MEYER, SCHENKEL) because the whole clause is parallel to the preceding one; still less however to "holy temple" (CALIXTUS, MATTHIES [EADIE] and others), since they are not built in a temple for a habitation. "Ye also" places the readers as being Christians, without any reference to their coming out of heathenism, as BAUMGARTEN CRUSIUS and BLEEK suppose, in connection with the whole ("the whole building"). This is in accordance with the parallelism of the application in ver. 22, which is not tautological, but marks a dialectic advance. [Most commentators take "in the Lord" as the antecedent of the relative. "You also," not "even you," "*καί* with its ascensive and slightly contrasting force marking the exalted nature of the association in which the Ephesians shared" (ELLICOTT).—R.]

Are being builded together, *συνοικοδομεῖσθε.*—This is indicative, not imperative (CALVIN and others), according to the context, which says what the readers, and the church in general, *are*, not what they *ought to be.* The preposition *συν*, as in *συναρμολογουμένη*, makes the connection with each other and with the whole; hence not merely with each other (MEYER), nor only with "the whole building" (HARLESS). The verb points to internal edification more strongly than *αὔξει*, denotes the process of becoming built, *magis magisque coaptari* (BUCER); hence with LUTHER we should retain: *miterbaut* WERDET, not *seid* (PASSAVANT). ["Are being builded together" is the nearest English equivalent. The preposition refers to the close and compact union of the component parts of the building (ELLICOTT).—R.]

For an habitation of God, *εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ.*—This sets forth the goal, as in ver. 21. The word here chosen in the stead of *ναόν* occurs only here and in Rev. xviii. 2, marking the place of dwelling (LUTHER: *Behausung*), while *ναόν* marks the place of worship. In this there is implied a significant advance, which explains the idea of the church. Comp. *Doct. Note* 5. The genitive *τοῦ θεοῦ* designates the Master of the house, who goes in and out, doing, regulating, taking care of everything, even to the smallest and most external matters. Hence this is not the same idea as in the previous verse with only a change of expression (MEYER, SCHENKEL), though it is not to be referred to *individual* Christians (HARLESS) and quite as little to be taken as dependent on *αὔξει, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς συνοικοδομεῖσθε* being regarded as a parenthesis (GRIESBACH, KNAPP), so that the sense would be: that a dwelling of God might arise (KOPPE, RUECKERT).

In the Spirit, *ἐν πνεύματι.*—This, being parallel to "in the Lord," which qualifies "holy," defines more closely the phrase, "of God," His relation to the "habitation": It is God, who dwells in you, in His church, in the Spirit as the element of His presence, hence in the Holy Spirit. The comparison with *χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* (Rom. xiv. 17), *ἀγάπη ἐν πνεύματι* (Col. i. 8) should not be so decidedly rejected as inappropriate by MEYER, as though this were possible only with abstract terms. Eph. iv. 1: *δέσμιος ἐν Χριστῷ* or *κυρίῳ*, 1 Thess. iv. 16: *νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ* are by no means abstract. Comp. on the idea of this verse, 1 Cor. iii. 16: *ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν*; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Rom. viii. 11. As the Church is a temple, which is holy not merely outwardly, but "in the Lord," so it is also a dwelling of God, where He does not dwell as the Shekinah in the temple, but in the Spirit, in His, the Holy Spirit, who is the Regent in this edifice, as He is efficient in its growth and occupation. So RIEGER, HARLESS, STIER. It is not then = *πνευματικόν* (*Greek Fathers*, RUECKERT

and others). in accordance with 1 Pet. ii. 5: *οἶκος πνευματικός*; nor is *ἐν* = *διά* (THEOPHYLACT [E. V.] and others), nor is the connection with the verb admissible: by virtue of, by means of the Holy Ghost ye are built together (MEYER, SCHENKEL, BLEEK). [HODGE also prefers this view, which disturbs the parallelism, giving the phrase an unwarranted emphasis. The view of RUECKERT is against the whole sense of the passage (ALFORD). Against MEYER's objection to the interpretation of Braune, see ELLICOTT *in loco*. Comp. EADIE, and *Galatians*, v. 5, against the distinction of HARLESS respecting the use of the article with *πνεῦμα*. The reference to the Holy Spirit is undoubtedly the correct one and thus the verse brings the Trinity into view.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The Trinity.* Ver. 18 points to the Trinity: To the Father through Christ in the Spirit. But the allusion in ver. 22 is more obscure. [Yet ALFORD correctly says of the latter part of this section: "Thus we have the true temple of the Father, built in the Son, inhabited in the Spirit; the offices of the three blessed Persons being distinctly pointed out; God THE FATHER, in all His fulness, dwells in, fills the church: that church is constituted an holy temple to Him in THE SON, —is inhabited by Him in the ever-present indwelling of the HOLY SPIRIT."—R.]

2. *The* ANTHROPOLOGY of this section.

a. *Heathenism in distinction from Judaism.* The *heathen* are termed those "*afar off*," the *Jews* those "*nigh*." The latter had the theocracy and a covenant of God with them, repeated in many ways, and containing a glorious promise; the former were without hope and without God. For neither in the idol deities of the people, nor in the fancied deities of the philosophers and the educated, did they have the living God; neither nature (Rom. i. 19, 20; Acts xiv. 17; xvii. 27), nor conscience could reveal to them the mercy, and the holy and sanctifying love of God, as this had become evident to the Jews in theocratic training and guidance. The heathen with their *natural* gifts wallowed ever more deeply in the creature, the Jews with their *gracious* gifts relied more and more on God's election, proudly exalting themselves, as did the former. Such distinctions, defining the relation of God to the nations and of the nations to God, define at the same time differences in the moral conduct of the Gentiles and the Jews. The former, left to themselves, did not see the arm of God shown to be so strong in nature, or the finger of God warning in the conscience, but fell into the mire, into the starless night of vile immorality; heathenism becomes ever worse and worse (Rom. i. 18-32); modern heathenism. which not only struggles to be free from the arm of God's power, but tears itself away from the heart of God with its thoughts of peace, is even more loathsome. Judaism falls away into externality ("the so-calledcircumcision in the flesh," ver. 11; Rom. ii. 14-29) throwing the *theocratic* feature into the background and out of practice, but giving prominence and power to the *national* element; modern Judaism has lapsed into the most frivolous emptiness.

b. *Heathenism* and *Judaism are alike* in this, that external position, neither in *natural* endowments nor in the gifts of revelation, decides as to the *personal* state of salvation. Whether one is a "stranger," as a heathen, or a "sojourner" as a Jew, amounts to nothing; he ought and must still be and become "of the household of God." Let him who enjoys the gifts of grace, think rather how to use them, to make them efficient in himself, than in false delight to despise others who lack them. In natural endowments there are indeed ways and means to the knowledge of God, which He can carry further unto eternal salvation, through Christ in the Holy Ghost however. We may not with philosophers, such as Hegel, place upon an equal footing the Jews with their theocracy, or the mission of preserving salvation, and the heathen, with their *cosmocracy*, or *anthropocracy*, the mission of moulding in its naturalness the subject attaining salvation, and regard both as united in the Theanthropos Christ, thinking then that they shall all become Christ's, God-men, instead of new men, God's men. Still less should we with Abelard, Zwingli and others, make exceptions arbitrarily, placing Socrates, Plato, Cicero and others, among the patriarchs and prophets, Apostles and believers, in heaven, as though we could act as judges in such a matter. Here it is best to keep within bounds, as did Paul, who sticks to what is evident, making no final judgment respecting individuals and their personal state of safety, nor overlooking the distinctions in what is similar.

c. *The continued validity* of these two forms. This antithesis is perceptible, not merely before Christ, but also in the Church which He established. They are not forms historically concluded, but active categories of human error, showing themselves constantly anew. Man suffers from a defect, though in the rich possession and masterly use of the most important natural endowments, if he is estranged from his Creator, and even in the possession, use and enjoyment of noble gifts of grace, if he has not attained to personal fellowship of life and heart with the Giver. Such a defect does not remain quiescent, but impels to restless opposition and enmity towards God and Man. The onesidedness urges ever deeper into discord, as the abuse of the gifts of nature or of grace is changed into the destruction of the same, coming home upon him who has enjoyed them.

d. *Natural and gracious endowments* do not *exclude* each other. The latter direct, purify, elevate the former, making them more productive. Human nature loses nothing, but gains much by means of the latter, if they are but rightly used: the Divine in the human, the Divinity in humanity is thus nurtured. It is thus that the state of things will be brought about when neither the individual, nor nations as a whole, will stand in hostile antagonism to one another, but will complement each other in peaceful contact, furthering each other's interests through the fulfilment of their calling in life or history, of their ministry with the gifts entrusted to them.

3. CHRISTOLOGY.

a. *Without Christ* the distance from God in the case of the Gentiles is not overcome, nor does

the nearness to God in the case of the Jews become fellowship with God. Without Him a man or a people is either "stranger" or "sojourner," and the advance from "stranger" to "of the household of God" is not through the "sojourner." As little as sonship of itself develops itself from slavery, so little avail circumcision, Mosaic law, theocracy, promise; only creative renewal (ver. 15) is of avail among Jews as well as Gentiles, and this is accomplished only through Him and in Him.

b. He is our Peace, He, in His Person; and this peace is here defined by its antithesis, "enmity" (ver. 15), by the hostility of Gentiles and Jews (ver. 11), by the estrangement of the Gentiles from God and His law, as well as the distance and separation from God the Father (vers. 12, 18) and the externality of the Jews (ver. 11)—as concord, as unity concluded and secured in agreement, in friendly intercourse. This peace is not a sensation, but a possession. HOFMANN (*Schriftbeweis*, II. 1, pp. 374) refers to the etymology, deriving the word from *εἴρη* and *ἶρις*, the circle, the place of assembly, or it may be traced to *εἴρω*, to speak, quiet, friendly, independent intercourse in speech. STIER (*Reden Jesu*, V., p. 224 on Jno. xiv. 27) compares it with שָׁלוֹם, and reaches thus the notion of prosperity, welfare. In this concord with its intercourse is found welfare, complete and symmetrical development. Hence the possession of this peace is at the same time a *status*. The first and main thing is peace with God; on this is based and depends necessarily the peace with our neighbor. Where the latter appears, the former is certainly efficient; hence Paul can here give special prominence to it in accordance with the context. He who has Christ, can speak of *His* peace (Jno. xiv. 27), has peace.*

c. The work of Christ culminates in the death of the cross (ver. 13: "made nigh in the blood of Christ;" ver. 16: "might reconcile them both to God through the cross"), having for its end the *reconciliation* with God and among each other (ver. 14: "who made both one;" ver. 16: "having slain the enmity;" ver. 17: "came and preached peace:" ver. 18; "we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father"), comp. Col. i. 20-22; Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18-20. Enmity is to be overcome only on the side of man, on the part of God "wrath" (ii. 3). We have only the popular expression: *ἱλάσθητί μοι* (Luke xviii. 13) and 2 Macc. i. 5; vii. 33: viii. 29: *καταλλάσσεσθαι ὑμῖν*.—*Non Deus inimicus erat hominibus, sed homines inimici erant Deo. Non cœpit homines amare, qui cum eo reconciliati essent, sed quia ab æterno homines amavit, idcirco decrevit homines sibi inimicos per Christiani secum reconciliare. Reconciliatio, morte Christi effecta, non est duplex seu mutua, sed simplex, h. e, Christus morte sua non Deum, hominum amantissimum, cum hominibus, sed homines, Deo inimicos, cum Deo reconciliavit* (WEBER). The enmity against God was extirpated by, through and in Christ; the attracting power of His Person, especially of His cross is so great, that man is won by Him for God. Thus the Father of Christ becomes the Father of men and the contending nations and creatures become peaceful children in one church and one Spirit. This is the reconciliation. It rests upon the *propitiation*, removing the wrath of God, which is however only the energy of His holy love for sinners against sin. But this is not treated of in this section. By this reconciliation of men resting on the atonement their relation not merely to *God* but also to the *law* is changed. In that He fulfilled the law in deed and in truth, performed God's will and suffered in obedience, He rendered it powerless in its single ordinances, dissolving its separative features; it thus gained through Him internal validity and importance, so that it no longer burdens men, but they stand and walk in and on the same as a common soil within salutary bounds. Here too all depends on His Person and our relation to Him (ver. 15: "in His flesh;" ver. 16: "in Him;" ver. 18: "through Him;" ver. 21: "in whom"—"in the Lord"); in Him and through Him that takes place which ought to take place both for us and in us. *Ipsa natura suscipienda erat, quæ liberanda* (AUGUSTINE). *Neque Christo imputari potuissent peccata nostra, nisi tum naturæ ejusdem vinculo tum voluntaria sponsione nobiscum unitus esset, neque justitia Christi nobis imputaretur; nisi in unum cum Ipso corpus coaluissemus* (TURRETINE).—He guards against that humanitarianism, which is only the glory of the flesh, as well as against a godless cosmopolitism["without God, in the world"]; He creates new, real men, who as the children become the possessors and rulers of the world.

4. *The law* here is the Mosaic law. This follows from the description: *τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν* (ver. 15), from the figure: *τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ* (ver. 14), and also from the statement that Christ has abolished this "in His flesh;" for it was precisely to this law that He was subject in the flesh; this was the "hedge" of the vineyard of God, the people of Israel; it was this which split the will of God into ordinances difficult to be grasped, and multiplied by casuistry most enormously. But here where the subject is not merely the enmity of the Jews against the Gentiles and against God, an enmity denoted by and connected with the law, but quite as much the enmity of the Gentiles against the Jews and against God, this too being joined with the law, we must admit a secondary reference to the law in the conscience. Rom. ii. 14, 15 permits such a reference, the connection requires it and the nature of the case explains it: the *bad* conscience is the still active conscience, so far as it is still *good*. The bad conscience is the justly judging conscience, is enmity, not as it should be with sin and the sinful subject, but with God, before whom it puts to shame, with our neighbor, from whom it divides us; the sinner against the law excuses himself and accuses God and men, by always finding the circumstances, relations, surroundings more to blame than himself. The voices of a bad conscience became for the heathen Furies, but not so easily Eumenides.

* [There is little necessity for seeking to sunder the two ideas, peace with God, peace among men, in this paragraph, since the complex notion alone meets the requirements of a fair exegesis. The doctrine to be deduced is one eminently Biblical: Right relations to God are the basis of right relations with man; the former involve the latter of necessity, while the latter constitute the evidence and indicator of the former. The complex notion of peace becomes a simple one, when thus regarded as simple because "He is our peace."—R.]

Nitimur in vetitum. He too, who holds to the law and to conscience, is an object of enmity for the frivolous world; where the law appears powerful, there is in the world discord, opposition—within the heart, in individuals and in the whole, and externally also. Thus enmity toward God and men clings to the law. We do not wish to have the will of God about us, above us, before us, and to know and feel ourselves under the law with its single decrees; it is impossible for us to have the law in us and peace at the same time, unless we have God Himself. Only fellowship of life with God in Christ removes the enmity which attaches to the law, as it appears in its commandments and ordinances over against the natural man.

5. *The church* is essentially a *fellowship*, closely united and *organic*. Her *support* is in Christ, her *beginning* in the pure and powerful Word of God, in His Apostles and prophets, her *design* respects every man and every nation, her *task* is not merely the worship of God, but abiding fellowship with God, and accordingly each individual must be prepared in the work of the Holy Ghost, freed from his singularity and framed into the whole (vers. 19-22). She is "the assured residence and abiding working-place" of God, from which He will and does work further into His world. In the world He indeed already has His real, immanent, continued presence, but in the church He is present in an extraordinary manner; she is His palace, His immediate surroundings, His family, while the world is His broad kingdom on which He operates from this, and which is subservient to it. Certain as the permanence of the church is, she is still in process of growth, not yet complete. But she is real, not merely ideal.

6. *The Holy Scriptures* are referred to in the expression: "the foundation of the Apostles and prophets" (ver. 20). There is here evidently a reminiscence of the words of Christ (Matt. xvi. 18: "Thou art Peter," *etc.*), in which He promises to build His church, not upon the person of Peter, but upon Peter's confession of the Person of Christ. The foundation of the church, the beginning of this building is not the persons of the Apostles, but their witness of Him, the preaching of the Apostles. *Scripture* is not the producer, but the product, not before the church, but within and for her. The *word of God* springing up in the Apostles, as prophets of God, as men to whom revelation was imparted by the Holy Ghost, and *preached* by them, is the *foundation*, but what is given in fixed form in the Scriptures is the *norm* for the church. She has her *support* and deepest ground in Christ, her beginning in the preaching of the Apostles, but her rule in the standard of truth contained in the Apostolic and prophetical Scriptures, the sufficiency of which is such, that no tradition is needed in addition. ["And no other foundation can suffice. When philosophical speculation or critical erudition, political affinity or human enactment supplants it, the structure topples and is about to fall. The opinions of Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, Wesley, Knox, or Erskine (and these were all "pillars"), are not the foundation; nor are the edicts and creeds of Trent, Augsburg, Dort, or Westminster. Such writings may originate sectional distinctions, and give peculiar shape to column or portico, shaft or capital, on the great edifice, but they can never be substituted for the one foundation" (EADIE).—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ponder this: What thou wast and wouldst have been without Him? what thou wast and hast become through Him? what thou wast and shouldst and shalt become, if thou abide with Him?—God is near thee, nearest of all, yet hast thou at first not noticed or known this at all, and still dost thou forget it and fail to feel it; many a one does not learn it and perishes, but he who learns it gains what is most glorious, the everlasting salvation of the soul, God's gifts, God Himself, as joint-heir with Christ. The moon is by no means so valuable to thee as the sun; it is nearer to the earth with its powerful influence notwithstanding its distance, than the near moon with its borrowed light. So is Christ nearer than Luther; He makes for thee spring with fruit abiding eternally.—See now, what it has cost Him, to bring thee near to God, who is so nigh, to win thee for Him! He must die, that thou mightest live in God and God in thee.—Do not deny it, underneath all hast thou enmity to God; in order not to be obliged to acknowledge His wrath, thou feignest friendship and love to Him, and still wilt not allow Him to rule in thee.—The foundation of religion is not a doctrine but a life, not the Apostles' life, but Christ and He alone, in His Person and in His life and death, His work and suffering. He disturbs the peace, the false one, in order to establish one which is real and eternal.

The Church of Christ is God's house and our own home, in which we should be children and become heirs. Here we are not only instructed, as in a school, but educated, in order to go out into the world and do what is good and useful; here not only is religion protected from the world, but we ourselves from irreligion.—In the church each one should feel, that the might of the whole is at his command, to be used for himself, to be efficient in him, quite as much as that he must serve with assiduity the whole; thus he himself will grow and thrive. The temple becomes a home: First worship Him, then live with Him. Is the home but a hovel at first, a hovel is still home. Do not take offence at the outward appearance of the church, but look at the internal loveliness!—Builded together on the one corner-stone, Christ, so that we are changed from servants or slaves into children and heirs. We are to become free! God hates the slavery of the world, or hireling service no less than we do tyranny. See to it that with thy hatred of tyrants and raving about freedom thou dost not still remain a slave.—In the Church of Christ we first really become men, the grace of God in Christ leads us directly to nature and to true humanity.

STARKE:—Where a soul will have hope toward God, it must have a testament or promise of God as its foundation.—Our life must properly be nothing else than a continued going out of ourselves and going to God. The great glory of Christians

as citizens of the city of God and members of His household. What was Roman citizenship in comparison? Acts xxii. 28. Thus we are assured of all possessions, liberties, privileges and protection. Ps. lxxxiv. 5.—What glorious and wonderful thing does not attach to the Church of God? Nothing is more majestic, because it is His temple; nothing more worthy of veneration, for He dwells therein; nothing more ancient, for the patriarchs and prophets labored thereon, nothing more solid, for Jesus Christ is its foundation, nothing firmer and stronger, for He is its corner-stone, nothing more exalted, for it reaches into eternity and the bosom of God, nothing more well-ordered and arranged, for the Holy Ghost is the architect; nothing more beautiful and agreeable in its variety, for stones come from all quarters, Jews and Gentiles, from every age, land, race and condition, nothing more roomy, for all the elect and righteous of all generations have a place therein, nothing more sacred, for it is consecrated to the Lord, nothing more divine, for it is a living edifice animated by the Holy Spirit.

Passavant:—God was not far off, but they were far from Him,—with heart and life far from Him in their darkness. How often are we—notwithstanding revelation and the knowledge of the Lord—far from God in our hearts and lives, while we are "in the world!" And that is the beginning and end of all heathenism. We are of a heathen race and always bring again into all our worldly—yes, Christian concerns, undertakings, plans and labors—something, much, that is Pagan.—Instead of making the holy law of their God serve as a sacred and salutary safeguard from the Gentiles, their customs, sins and enormities, the Israelites turned their hearts toward hate and bitter enmity against all the nations about them.—Though both Greek and Roman occupied the most beautiful isles, the loveliest home; yet were they still on an earth foreign to them and not yet confirmed as their property; above them was a heaven, though so glad and beautiful—still—unknown and strange; under them unknown depths and abysses full of night and horror. As really homeless they walked the earth, not knowing whence they were or whither their living and dying would lead them! The holiest and sweetest of the Here and the Hereafter remained closed and strange to them. With all their advantages of form, of culture and customs,—with all the beauty and brilliancy, in which many of them are to-day still patterns for us in earthly things,—they were, over against the Israelites, at most like guests, suffered to remain or kindly received beside the children and members of the household.—Ask thy heart, thou who art called, and mayhap art, a Christian; hast thou really given thyself to thy God? Hast thou transferred every hall, chamber, nook and corner, all the heights and depths of thine inner man to Him for a living, pure, spiritual indwelling? Art thou His temple?–[Christ our peace; 1) In time and in eternity; 2) Before God, in His Judgment; 3) In all sufferings, in all anxieties of life; 4) In need, in death; 5) In God's rest, in His love.—Jesus Christ: 1) The cause, 2) Ground, 3) Strength of all peace.—It is Christ's Cross, that atones for Christians; His blood sanctifies them; His Spirit impels them; His love permeates them; His name unites them in one and the same grace.—R.]—

Rieger:—The wretchedness of Paganism is not represented now-a-days in its full extent.—The matter is now inverted; first the heathen are granted a fortunate fate in eternity, that thus afterwards the difference between nature and grace, faith in the gospel and walking by the feeble light of conscience may be altogether ignored.—The distinction between Jews and Gentiles was brought about by man, but fixed by God Himself, and guarded by the entire ecclesiastical polity of the Jews as by a hedge. Then indeed the human heart took occasion from this for much pride and mutual enmity. This too must then be interrupted and removed by another Divine interposition, which took place in the sending of His Son.—He who thoroughly believes the word of the Apostle, accepting Christ as the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, in the matter of our salvation, is not only in connection with the foundation, but is in love built in with all the living stones beside Him; abides too for the further work of the good Spirit, who is the master-builder of this edifice, but also the future Possessor and Ruler of every well-erected habitation.

Heubner:—Quesnel distinguishes three kinds of looking back at former sins: a longing, faithless one, destructive of grace, a distrustful, disquieting one, hindering the course of grace, a penitent, thankful one, increasing grace.—Without Christ we can be alive in no church; without Him there is no holy kingdom of God on earth. Christ transfers us into the state of the pious, into the congregation of the saints; with Him we are in a state, embracing all true Israelites, in the kingdom of the just and blessed. Heavenly citizenship is a favor from Christ. Without Him man has no part in the covenant of promise, in the covenant with God, which gives salvation. Christianity is the eternal covenant with God. Without Christ we are without hope.—Without Christ we are without God, because the true God has not yet become ours. First with Christ is God rightly known and revealed; we know that He is *our* God, who cares for us sinners and desires our salvation. Outside of Christianity God remains as it were only a general idea.—The Personality of God is illustrated by nothing so well as by the Personality of His Son. Losing Christ is losing God, denying Him leads to Atheism. Who can read this description of the heathen condition without horror? Yet that is the picture of many baptized people; they live without Christ, they have fallen away from Christ and that leads to apostasy from God. An unhappy withdrawing of the heart from God continues, unless we are brought nigh through Christ.

Christ's death is the nations' peace! Who can quarrel and fight with others under the cross of Christ?—The whole of mankind should be one man, one holy body whose Head is Christ. Humanity must be held together by one Head, else unity is impossible. Who is available for this, if God had not given such an one? The highest union of men is that of becoming one in Christ; then they make one family, one household.–Since the establishment of Christianity, God no longer

knows any distinction of nations; all have the same access to the Father, because Christianity gives one Spirit to all. That is the business of Christ, the Only-Begotten, to bring the wandering children to the Father, and to reconcile those divided He is the only and the indispensable Guide. He, who imagines that he will go alone to the Father, will be rejected, because he comes as a self-righteous one. But he, who clings to Christ, will not be rejected.—Men lost through sin the heavenly family-right or the fellowship with angels, through Christ they obtain it again. Without Him eternal banishment were our fate. Now we belong again to the house and family of God.—The Christian Church is the only edifice, that will last. What others, the free-masons for example, boast of as their building amounts to nothing; it will perish.

STIER:—There was a little light even in the midst of heathenish darkness, just as on the other hand *Israel* with all the light of the law and the promise sat for the most part in the shadow of death —The enmity between Israel and the Gentiles was at bottom only the prominent manifestation of the enmity of the flesh against God's truth and love, against the Spirit already in the law itself. The same hate and antagonism to the Living One manifested itself in the scorn and hatred of Israel on the part of the Gentiles, led to false glorying in their pre-eminence on the part of the Jews. Something analogous continues to exist everywhere, where Christ has not made all new and free.—Christ is humanity, on that account He can represent it.—Let us hold fast to the words of the Apostles and prophets as the foundation of the Church, but recognize the words respecting Christ as the pith and marrow of the teaching.

[EADIE:—Ver. 11. The exercise of memory would deepen their humility, elevate their ideas of Divine grace, and incite them to ardent and continued thankfulness.—Ver. 12. The Jewish nation—had the Messiah—not Jesus indeed—but the Christ in promise. He was the great subject—the one, glowing, pervading promise of their inspired oracles. But the Gentiles were "without Christ."—"The commonwealth of Israel" is that government framed by God, in which religion and polity were so conjoined, that piety and loyalty were synonymous, to fear God and honor the king were the same obligation.—They had hope of nothing a sinner should hope for; their future was a night without a star. They were godless, having no one to cry to, to trust in, to love, praise, and serve. "In the world," dark, hostile and under Satan's dominion.—Ver. 15. Deep hostility lay in their bosoms; the Jew looked down with supercilious contempt upon the Gentile, and the Gentile reciprocated and scowled upon the Jew as a haughty and heathenish bigot.—One *new* man—the Gentile is not elevated to the position of the Jew; but Jew and Gentile together are both raised to a higher platform than the circumcision ever enjoyed. Spiritual blessing in itself, and not merely pictured in type, is possessed by the Jew as well as the Gentile.—Ver. 16. Jesus reconciles us to God by turning away the Divine anger from us. God has shown infinite love to the sinner, and infinite hatred to his sin, in the sufferings of the cross, so that we tremble at His severity, while we are in the arms of His mercy.—Ver. 18. Christians do not approach some dark and spectral phantom, nor a grim and terrible avenger. It is not Jehovah in the awful attitude of Judge and governor, but Jehovah as a Father.—Ver. 20. That man, "Jesus," who was the "Christ," the Divinely appointed, qualified, and accepted Saviour, unites and sustains the Church. Is He not in His truth, His blood, His power, His legislation, and His presence to His Church, Himself "the chief corner-stone?"—Ver. 21. Every stone is in its place, and fits its place. One's ingenuity devises what another's activity works out. As Fergusson says—"By taking bond with Christ the foundation, they are fastened one to another."—Jehovah dwelt in His temple: 1. To instruct His people; 2. To accept the services of His people. God inhabits this spiritual fane for spiritual ends—spiritual sacrifices are still laid on the altar to God.—The Church is one, holy and Divine; it rests on Christ—is possessed by God—filled with the Spirit—and is ever increasing.—R.]

[The so-called Circumcision occasionally finds a parallel in the externalness of a so-called church.—Hand-wrought ordinances are a fruitful source of pride.—In discovering the condition of men out of Christ we must reverse the order of the Apostle: we see that they are "in the world," learn that they are "without God," and despite their stout denials conclude with certainty that they have "no hope."—Near the cross, near each other.—Christ came to destroy the works of the devil; He destroys partition-walls, which we are slow to class with these works. Christ came to abolish Jewish casuistry and hair-splitting distinctions and ordinances, but how much of this remains in His church. Such things have not tended to make peace.—The peace Christ preaches is no armed neutrality. As disbanded armies give laborers for a country's prosperity, so the activities once employed in hostility against God and man, are turned to edification.—*We have* our access, do we really enjoy it?—Let men sneer at the "saints"—it is a term of privilege, not of presumption, implying here the highest citizenship, the most exalted adoption, while in itself it means that God is making us sinful ones holy like Himself, that we may the more enjoy the blessings of His household.—Let us hold to that church, whose foundation and corner-stone are here set forth, and then despite all the mistakes of the past and imperfection of the present, we shall see in her the reality described in the figures of verse 21, and find in our own experience that we, together with this corner-stone, "are being builded together for a habitation in the Spirit."—R.]

C. The office and service of the church.

CHAP. III. 1–21.

1. *The office in and for this church.*

(CHAP. III. 1–13.)

1 For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ [Christ Jesus][1] for [in behalf
2 of] you Gentiles, If [indeed] ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God
3 which is given me to you-ward: How that [That] by revelation he made known
unto me the mystery [the mystery was made known[2] to me]; ([*omit* parenthesis]
4 as I wrote [have written] afore in few words; Whereby, when ye read, ye may un-
derstand my knowledge [In accordance with which, while reading, ye can perceive
5 my understanding][3] in the mystery of Christ,) [*omit*)] Which in other ages [ge-
nerations][4] was not made known unto [to] the sons of men, as it is [has been][5] now
6 revealed unto [to] his holy apostles and prophets by [in] the Spirit; That the Gen-
tiles should be [are] fellow heirs, and of the same body [fellow members], and par-
takers [fellow-partakers] of his [the][6] promise in Christ [Christ Jesus][7] by [through]
7 the gospel: Whereof I was made [became][8] a minister, according to the gift of the
grace of God given unto [which was given[9] to] me by the effectual working [ac-
8 cording to the working] of his power. Unto me, who am less than the least of all
saints, is [was] this grace given, that I should preach among [to preach to][10] the
9 Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; And to make all *men* see what *is* the
fellowship [dispensation][11] of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world
[*lit.*, from the ages] hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ
10 [*omit* by Jesus Christ]:[12] To the intent that now unto the principalities and pow-
ers in [the] heavenly *places* might be [made] known by [through] the church the
11 manifold wisdom of God, According to the eternal purpose which he purposed
12 [wrought] in Christ Jesus our Lord: In whom we have [our] boldness and [our][13]
13 access with [in] confidence by the faith of [through our faith on][14] him. Where-
fore I desire that ye faint not [I beseech *you* not to faint][15] at my tribulations for
you, which is [are] your glory.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 1.—['Ι η σ ο ῦ is omitted in א.[1] D.[1] F.; it is bracketted by Alford. The order ln A. B. C. D.[2 3] K. L. is Χ ρ ι σ τ ο ῦ 'Ι η σ ο ῦ, so the corrector in א. For the inverted order of the E. V., there is no authority.—R.]

[2] Ver. 3.—א. A. B. C. D. and others [many cursives, most versions, including the *Syriac* and *Vulgate*] read ἐγνωρίσθη; the internal grounds (Stier notices the agreement with i. 9, the distinct reference to the Trinity, the great probability of an alteration from ver. 5) are not stronger than the external. [The reading of the *Rec.* (ἐγνώρισε) supported by D.[3] K. L., and some minor authorities, is considered an explanatory gloss by most modern editors.—R.]

[3] Ver. 4.—[This verse must be thus recast to conform to the exegesis of Dr. Braune, which agrees exactly with that of Ellicott, Alford and others.—R.]

[4] Ver. 5.—[The preposition ἐν is an explanatory interpolation, having no uncial support, rejected by all modern editors. —R.]

[5] Ver. 5.—[The Greek aorist is joined with νῦν, but in English we cannot say: as it was now revealed. Since *now* is emphatic, we must adopt the English perfect, as indeed is frequently necessary.—R.]

[6] Ver. 6.—[The *Rec.* inserts αὐτοῦ. It is rejected by most modern editors, since the more important MSS. (א. A. B. C. D.[1]) with a number of minor authorities are against it.—On *are* instead of *should be*, see *Exeg. Notes.* The words: *fellow-heirs*, *fellow-members*, *fellow-partakers*, are analogous to the unusual Greek compounds, seemingly coined by the Apostle. Tischendorf (on the authority of some of the best MSS., (א. A. B.[1] and others in the various instances) adopts the forms: σ υ ν κληρ., σύ ν σω., σ υ ν μέτ., instead of the more euphonic and usual forms. So Ellicott.—R.]

[7] Ver. 6.—[Modern editors generally accept Χ ρ ι σ τ ῷ 'Ι η σ ο ῦ (א. A. B. C., cursives and versions) instead of τῷ Χριστῷ (*Rec.*, D. E. F. G. K. L.; most cursives) —R.]

[8] Ver. 7.—The reading ἐ γ ε ν ή θ η ν is found in א. A. B. D.[1] F. G. and others; ἐγενόμην [*Rec.*, C. D.[3] K. L.] being the more usual form, was likely to creep in.

[9] Ver. 7.—[The *Rec.* has: τ ὴ ν δ ο θ ε ῖ σ α ν, on the authority of D.[3] K. L., most cursives, many versions and fathers; adopted by Tischendorf, Meyer, Braune. The genitive: τ ῆ ς δ ο θ ε ί σ η ς is found in א. A. B. C. D.[1] F. G., 10 cursives and a few versions; adopted by Lachmann, Rückert, Alford, Ellicott and most later critics. The latter is better sustained; the presence of the genitive in ver. 2 casts a doubt on it, but to my mind not sufficient to warrant adopting the accusative.—The longer form substituted above brings out better the connection between *given* and what follows.—R.]

[10] Ver. 8.—[*Rec.* inserts ἐν before τ ο ῖ ς ἔ θ ν ε σ ι ν, on the authority of D. F. K. L., most cursives, versions and fathers; retained by Ellicott and Eadie. The suspicion of an alteration from Gal. i. 16 (a parallel passage) is very great, and as its omission, supported by א. A. B. C., presents a *lectio difficilior*, it is rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Braune and others.—The *Rec.* also inserts τῶν after πάντων against all our manuscript authority.—The rendering: *to preach*

is more literal, conforms better with the sense of the aorist: *was* given, as well as with the infinitive construction retained in ver. 9.—R.]

[11] Ver. 9.—[The reading κοινωνία (*Rec.*) instead of οἰκονομία (א. A. B. C. D. F. K. L.) is an explanatory gloss, supported by no important authority and rejected by all critical editors.—Πάντας is omitted in A. א.[1] (afterwards added). *Men* need not be supplied, since the *personal* reference is not marked —א. (with a few minor authorities) omits ἐν after τῷ θεῷ.—R.]

[12] Ver. 9.—[The longer reading of the *Rec.* is supported by D.[3] K. L., a number of cursives, and a few fathers; διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is omitted in א. A. B. C. D.[1] F. G., a few cursives, the best versions and many fathers. It is therefore rightly rejected by critical editors.—R.]

[13] Ver. 12.—[The second τήν is omitted in א. A. B. (rejected by Lachmann, Ruckert, bracketted by Alford); but nearly all cursives and fathers support it, together with א[3] C. D. F. G. K. L. (though with some variations in position); accepted by Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott and most.—R.]

[14] Ver. 12.—[This emendation gives the correct sense better than the literal but harsh and equivocal rendering of the E. V.—R.]

[15] Ver. 13.—[Dr. Braune's exegesis requires the following rendering: Wherefore I pray (God) that (I) faint not." etc. See *Exeg. Notes*.—The *Rec.* has ἐκκακεῖν, with C. D.[3] F. K. L. Ellicott (with A. B.[1] D.[1] E.) ἐνκακεῖν, while most editors accept the form ἐγκακεῖν (א. B.[2]). Comp. my *Textual Notes* on Gal. vi. 9. Meyer does not accept the view that the first named is a doubtful word, but thinks it was in oral use and first introduced into writing by Paul; the other reading being an attempt at improvement. He is almost alone in this opinion.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Connection and Summary. With τούτου χάριν the Apostle refers to what precedes (ii. 19–22), not exclusively to ver. 22 (BLEEK, also MEYER), which is only a conclusion, although a comprehensive one. The reference to vers. 11–22 (STIER) is preferable to that of BLEEK, yet the first part of that section contains merely an antithesis which has been overcome and is past. Without any fear of a relapse he now looks forward and points to the end and *aim*.—From the fact that the church, "of the family of God," is built together in Christ "unto an habitation of God in the Spirit," there proceeds as a result: *the Apostle's intercession and exhortation* (vers. 14-19)* the weight and indispensable consideration of which rest upon the *office*, not the *person*, although person and office do and must include each other; if the former rightly regards and administers the latter, the latter makes its importance felt chiefly in its bearer. Hence vers. 1-12 treat of the apostolic office as the appointed *subject* of the intercession and exhortation. Ver. 1 describes the present efficient *bearer* of this office *in general;* ver. 2 defines the office as a *gift of God's grace*, which according to vers. 3, 4 has been imparted in a *special manner* and according to ver. 5 *now for the first time*, having as *its task* the *reception of all nations through the proclamation of the gospel* (ver. 6). Vers. 7, 8 *a* mark the *service* and the *unworthiness* of its recipient, ver. 8 *b*, 9, the *extent* of the task allotted to this gift; ver. 10 points to the *aim;* ver. 11, back to the *beginning* and foundation; ver. 12, to the *carrying* out of the task already begun. So STIER in the main.

Ver. 1. *The person holding the office.* **For this cause.** Τούτου χάριν is an emphatic expression, occurring elsewhere only in iii. 14; Tit. i. 5. It is stronger than διό, διὰ τοῦτο, introducing something special. [It means *for this reason* and is aptly rendered in the E. V.]—To this strong expression corresponds: **I Paul,** ἐγὼ Παῦλος.—The phrase is found also in 2 Cor. x. 1; Gal. v. 2; Col. i. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 18; Philemon 19 (and ver. 9). Similarly ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης, Rev. i. 9; xxii. 8; xxi. 2 (*Rec.*). He mentions his name, not on account of his person (ver. 8), but because of his office and the importance of what he is doing.

The prisoner of Christ Jesus [ὁ δέσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ].—In iv. 1 alone do we find ἐν κυρίῳ, elsewhere always (2 Tim. i. 8; Philemon i. 9) as here, with the genitive. It is undoubtedly the genitive *auctoris, causæ.** WINER, p. 178. So δεσμοὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, "bonds of the gospel" (Philemon 13) are bonds which belong to the service of the gospel, ὀνειδισμὸν Χριστοῦ (Heb. xiii. 13) is reproach which Christ bore, παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor. i. 3). Our phrase is not= for Christ's sake, *propter Christum.* A special emphasis rests on the expression. In the Epistle to Philemon written at the same time (ver. 1), it even stands in the place where "Apostle" is usually found, and in ver. 9 ("as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Christ Jesus") it is similarly used. Here it is not a predicate, but in apposition to the subject already so emphatically named, not an adjective, but a substantive added for the sake of description. BENGEL aptly remarks: *legatus, isque vinctus.* As if he would say: I Paul, the prisoner, not of the emperor, nor of the soldier, but of Christ Jesus, whose Apostle I am. So, following RIEGER, PASSAVANT and STIER. MEYER approaches this view (= δοῦλος Χριστοῦ).

[The phrase is taken as a predicate (εἰμί being supplied) by very many from CHRYSOSTOM to BEZA, KOPPE, MEYER. The Syriac version sustains this view, which simplifies the construction very greatly, but is open to great objection: (1) It makes "for this cause" and "on behalf of you" tautological; (2) disconnects vers. 2 ff. from ver. 1, since they then do not explain it; (3) the article could only occur in the predicate with special emphasis; this emphasis is unpauline and inconsistent with "if indeed ye have heard" (ALFORD).—Other verbs are supplied in some codices. MEYER formerly accepted a *brachyology:* I Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus, (am a prisoner) for you Gentiles, but gave it up as untenable in his 2d ed. See further below.—R.]

In behalf of you Gentiles, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν.—This added phrase justifies the above interpretation. Paul is imprisoned *for* the Gentiles, suffers to their benefit, as is said also in Phil. i. 7, 12 ff.; Col. iv. 3. Although Paul had to suffer on account of his proclamation

* [According to the usual view, ver. 14 is a resumption of ver. 1, all that intervenes being a digression. Dr. Braune takes another view of the construction (see his note at the close of ver. 1), but is forced to accept a connection of thought which amounts to the same thing.—R.]

* [Χριστοῦ standing first perhaps implies that it was the Messiahship of Jesus which caused his imprisonment (ALFORD).—R.]

of the gospel among the Gentiles (Acts xxi. 21, 28 f.; xxii. 21 ff.), yet ὑπέρ is not=*propter* (GROTIUS).* It refers to ὑμᾶς (ver. 2) and is rather *ad evangelium gentibus annuntiandum* than *annuntiatum* (FLATT). BENGEL: "*Pauli studio erga gentes incensi sunt persecutores, ut vincirent illum; et vincula ipsa profuere gentibus*, ver. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 10." Here then everything "odious" is to be rejected from the term, differing thus from the expression: "once Gentiles in the flesh" (ii. 10). OLSHAUSEN is excellent: "He here makes mention of his bonds, in order to bring into stronger prominence the glory just described in contrast with the present condition of the church." HARLESS also remarks: "Paul would have the Gentiles led to none other than Him, whose chains he wore, and would thus give a proof of the glory of such fellowship, exalted above suffering and shame." STIER: "The bonds should especially show that proof of the office which proceeds from *internal efficacy;* the bonds themselves also *preach* to the Gentiles, and themselves *reveal* to the Apostle something new."

At this point the sentence breaks off, and is resumed again in ver. 8, since it is peculiar to the *naive* style of the Greeks, to place the name in the nominative in a sentence, the end of which is not immediately contemplated, and since ἐμοί (ver. 8) is in a strikingly emphatic position, so that it refers back to ἐγώ (ver. 1) and thus indicates the resumption of the interrupted construction. So ŒCUMENIUS, GROTIUS.

[Notwithstanding Dr. Braune's preference for this view of the construction, it seems to be untenable. (1) Though examples of such a change of case may be found, Origen affirms that it is a solecism. (2) There is no natural connection of thought afforded by this view, while "for this cause" loses its meaning; the grace was not given for this cause, *i. e.*, because they were built in. (3) Ver. 8 has another obvious connection, *viz.*, with vers. 6, 7, so that according to this view "the leading thought of the antapodosis in ver. 8 is clumsily forestalled in vers. 6, 7" (ALFORD).—R.]

Most however (from LUTHER to WINER, p. 526 f., BLEEK) find in ver. 13 a return to the thought of our verse, and in ver. 14 a resumption and continuation. [This view is supported, among others by THEODORET, BENGEL, FLATT, LACHMANN, RUECKERT, HARLESS, DE WETTE (who however regards the construction as "scarcely Pauline"), OLSHAUSEN, EADIE, HODGE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT. It is the simplest view, except that of MEYER, and not open to any grave objection. (1.) It makes the τούτου χάριν of ver. 14 take up the same emphatic phrase from ver. 1. (2.) It gives to that phrase as well as to the whole chapter an appropriate meaning, while a long digression or parenthetical statement is not unpauline. In view of the truth he has just uttered (ii. 19-22), he is about to pray for them, but other thoughts come in. He is a prisoner (ver. 1), that too in behalf of the Gentiles; the thought of his office leads him away (vers. 2-12), when at length he comes back to the thought of imprisonment (ver. 13) with a request that they would not despond on account of his sufferings—then he resumes (ver. 14). The whole seems Pauline, and need occasion no difficulty.—R.]

BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS accepts an anacoluthon without any subsequent continuation. CALVIN [*legatione fungor*] and others supply πρεσβεύω (from vi. 20); others κεκαύχημαι (from Phil. ii. 16); while such supplements as *postulo, hoc scribo* [CAMERARIUS], *cognovi mysterium* [JEROME], *sum captivus adhuc, etc.*, are quite ancient, and occur in some copies. A prevalent view (from the *Syriac* to MEYER and SCHENKEL) accepts εἰμί as the proper supplement; but it can scarcely be asserted, that Paul, τούτου χάριν, just on this account, *is* the Apostle to the Gentiles, the prisoner of the Lord, and that too κατ' ἐξοχήν. [See above.]

[Among other untenable views there should be mentioned that of ZANCHIUS, CRAMER and HOLZHAUSEN, who suppose the resumption to take place in ver. 13. Against this may be urged the simple διό, the want of connection thus given to ver. 14 with its strong τούτου χάριν, and "the insufficiency of such a secondary sentiment as that in ver. 13 to justify the long parenthesis full of such solemn matter, as that of vers. 2-12" (ALFORD).—To take the whole chapter as parenthetical is still more objectionable. In that case the digression were too long, and the parts of the chapter would not find their proper connection; besides chap. iv. does *not* resume the thought begun in our verse.—R.]

Ver. 2. *The apostolic office is a gift of grace.*

If indeed ye have* heard, εἴ γε ἠκούσατε.—It is evident, first of all, that εἰ *cannot* be regarded as purely hypothetical, since it is written by the prisoner "in behalf of you," and also since the object they have learned: "the dispensation of the grace of God," will not admit of such a view. It is not necessary, however, to take it as=ἐπεί, *since*, Acts iv. 9; Rom. xi. 21; 1 John iv. 11; see WINER, p. 417. The same is true of εἴ γε in iv. 21; for there, immediately after ver. 20 ("but ye did not so learn Christ"), expressing accurate knowledge of the church, we find: εἴ γε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε, "if indeed ye have heard him." The particle occurs elsewhere only in Col. i. 23; Gal. iii. 4 (2 Cor. v. 3, we have in various readings both εἴ γε and εἴπερ). It does not necessarily indicate a doubt, as does εἴπερ (HERMANN, *ad Viger.*, p. 833), and hence is more like ἐπείγε, though it must not be regarded as precisely equivalent. In the form there is expressed an uncertainty, an assumption, which challenges a self-scrutiny in the case of every reader or hearer. ["Assuming that;" ALFORD, ELLICOTT, not in itself implying the rectitude of the assumption made, which depends on the context.—R.] The context, however, confirms the truth of the assumption, that they have heard. This turn of expression is therefore a rhetorical,

* [It was indeed the fact that he was a prisoner *on account* of the Gentiles, but this is not the prominent thought here. Hence EADIE may or may not be correct in saying: "In writing to the Ephesians he could not forget that the suspicion of his having taken an Ephesian named Trophimus into the temple with him, created the popular disturbance that led to his capture and his final appeal to Cæsar, his journey to Rome, and his imprisonment in the imperial city."—R.]

* [This seems to be one of those cases where the Greek aorist is properly rendered by the English perfect.—R.]

"a more elegant and suggestive reminder" (MEYER) of the preaching of Paul, as if he had written: "for ye have heard," or "since ye have heard." ESTIUS: "*εἴγε non est dubitantis, sed potius affirmantis.*" Or we may say with STIER, that it is pre-supposition, not without a slight touch of irony, in case it were otherwise; or still more correctly: in case they would not consider the Apostle as the Apostle of the Lord for them; not to have recognized Paul, not to have received his teaching would be equivalent to not having heard. Hence it is not correct to conclude from these words, that the Epistle was not written to Ephesus (see *Introd.* § 5, 2). Nor does this phraseology render it necessary to accept a wider, partially unknown, circle of readers (HARLESS, STIER, BLEEK and others). The assumption of CALVIN is inadmissible: "It is credible, that when he labored in Ephesus, he was silent on these topics." Nor is it at all necessary to do violence to the verb, and render it: *firmiter retinetis* (PELAGIUS), *intellexistis* (ANSELM, GROTIUS and others). The reference is simply to preaching, especially that of Paul; hence this is termed ἀκοή (Rom. x. 16 f.). [See *Romans, in loco*, p. 349.—R.]

Of the dispensation of the grace of God [τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ].—Οἰκονομία here follows the close of chap. ii. with its οἰκοδομή. There the building of "an habitation" is treated of, here the establishment of a household, a νέμειν (STIER). See on i. 10. This is a matter belonging to God, or still more closely to "the grace of God." Hence it is to be regarded not as an apostolic function (PELAGIUS, ANSELM, LUTHER: *office*. [HODGE] and others), but as a Divine arrangement. It must also be remembered that we find here, not χάρισμα, but χάρις. This χάρις is then more closely defined:

Which is given me to you-ward.—Τῆς δοθείσης μοι, as in Rom. xii. 3; xv. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 10; Gal. ii. 9, with ὑμῖν 1 Cor. i. 4. Hence it is not to be understood of the Apostolic office exclusively; although the context here points to that (εἰς ὑμᾶς, as in Gal. ii. 8, εἰς τὰ ἔθνη). Εἰς ὑμᾶς marks the readers as the object about which the Apostle's position and activity was concerned, and is neither=ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, *vestra causa* (MORUS), nor=ἐν ὑμῖν, *in vobis* (*Vulgate*) or *inter vos*, but upon, towards you: as εἰς ἡμᾶς, i. 19: hence it is not merely: with respect to you (RUECKERT). ["To you-ward," though now unusual, expresses very well the precise shade of meaning.—R.]

Thus the apostolic office is described as a gift of God's grace, yet not so imparted and conferred that a "dispensation" is not necessary in addition, but so that the person himself (μοι) is especially prepared for it. Here we must include all that God had done for and in Paul, from childhood on (Gal. i. 15), near and in Damascus (Acts ix. 1 ff.; xxii. 3 ff.; xxvi. 12 ff.); in Jerusalem (Acts xxii. 21) and elsewhere (Gal. ii. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 8-10; 2 Cor. xii. 1-10). So RUECKERT especially. To regard this as merely *munus apostolicum gratiose, immerito beneficio Divino creditum* is too superficial. Nor can we in accordance with Col. i. 25: "the dispensation of God which was given to me for you," explain it thus, that the administrative office of the Divine grace was committed to him (ANSELM, GROTIUS and others); here τῆς δοθείσης belongs to χάριτος, here the matter is regarded under a different aspect, and the context is different, since "heard" is the governing verb, and the office is not heard.

[This view of οἰκονομία is defended by EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT (HODGE mentions it, though he thinks it differs from his own merely in form). The only remaining question is respecting the genitive. It is obviously not that of the subject, but either that of the object, "the material with respect to which the dispensation was to be exercised" (ALFORD) or that of "the point of view" (ELLICOTT). These scarcely differ here, but some such sense is favored by the passive verb ἐγνωρίσθη (ver. 3 where the *Rec.* has ἐγνώρισε).—R.]

The method of communication. Vers. 3, 4.

Ver. 3. **That**, ὅτι, gives prominence to a particular part of what they have heard, the essential part of the dispensation of the grace of God. [ALFORD: "Epexegesis of the fact implied in ἠκούσατε τὴν οἰκ., *viz.*, of the fact that: as we say 'how that.'" *That* is the literal rendering, "how that" is a rather inelegant exegesis.—R.]

By revelation was made known to me [κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι].—The emphasis here rests on "by revelation," since it comes first. As neither τινα nor τήν is added, the reference is not to some particular event, definite in itself, but not more closely indicated (Acts ix. 1 ff., as OLSHAUSEN thinks, or Acts xxii. 21), nor to some occurrence definitely designated, but rather to the mode of making known. It is an adverbial qualification of ἐγνωρίσθη=ἀπεκαλύφθη (ver. 5), or like Gal. i. 15, 16. Κατά denotes, as in κατ' ἄνθρωπον (Rom. iii. 5 and frequently), κατὰ χάριν (Rom. iv. 4), a mode which obtains or prevails (WINER, p. 375). [So MEYER, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, HODGE apparently.—R.] Even δι' ἀποκαλύψεως (Gal. i. 12) does not point to a single revelation (STIER). [Comp. *in loco*. ELLICOTT says the allusion in the phrase as it occurs Gal. ii. 2 "is rather to the *norma* or *rule*, here to the *manner*."—R.] It might be interpreted (according to PASSOW, *sub voce*, II. 3, p. 1598 *b*) like ἔρχεσθαι κατὰ θήραν, to go hunting, or 2 Tim. i. 1: ἀπόστολος κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν, apostle for the proclamation; indeed G. HERMANN explains Gal. ii. 2: for the explanation, proclamation, presentation. But ἀποκάλυψις is only what occurs to man from God, not what men have to impart to one another. The word μοι, placed last, indicates that he treats of something which does not distinguish him personally, but which belongs to his office: "Revelation" and "apostles and prophets" are correlatives; γνωρίζειν is the general making known, but ἀποκάλυψις denotes that by means of which the official personages thus endowed are immediately distinguished, by means of which the Apostles become prophets. See ver. 5 and *Doctr. Notes* on ii. 20.

The mystery, τὸ μυστήριον, altogether indefinite, is, like i. 9, the decree of salvation and grace in Christ (STIER), the renewing of humanity through Christ, especially moreover the

calling of the Gentiles (ALLIOLI). To refer it to the latter exclusively (most commentators from CHRYSOSTOM to HARLESS, MEYER, SCHENKEL, BLEEK) is not admissible, even though ver. 6 follows.

[On the *precise reference* of the word "*mystery*" in this chapter. The great majority of commentators, including HODGE, EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, accept the more restricted view just mentioned, but admit the wider reference in ver. 4 (and many in ver. 9). The reasons for so doing are quite strong: the *purport* of the mystery is set forth in ver. 6, the dispensation of grace spoken of is "to you-ward," a leading thought of the Epistle has been this calling of the Gentiles to fellowship with the Jews. Nor can it be urged against this, that it presents a matter unworthy of this designation and not at all mysterious. THOLUCK (Rom. xi. 25) thus classifies the meanings of our term: (1) "Such matters of fact, as are inaccessible to reason, and can only be known through revelation: (2) such matters as are patent facts, but the process of which cannot be entirely taken in by the reason." In the latter sense, the calling of the Gentiles was a "mystery," is so still in view of the separatism, which to the Gentile mind is in some aspects yet stronger. Evidently the indefinite reference, which leaves this special fact out of view, is inadmissible, while ver. 4 seems to require the wider meaning. Accordingly the alternating reference has been accepted to meet these requirements. To my mind it is unsatisfactory: (1.) It seems unlikely that a word should thus vary so speedily, when there is so little to mark a difference. (2.) The difficulty in construction is thus increased: the E. V. accepts a parenthesis so as to connect vers. 5, 6 with "mystery" in our verse, and thus leave the wider reference of ver. 4, undisturbed; but this is altogether arbitrary, since the relative clause (ver. 5) is to be joined directly with "mystery" (ver. 4) in accordance with the common structural usages of the Apostle. (3.) Since then the grammatical connection is such, the purport of "the mystery of Christ" is set forth in ver. 6, and the alternating reference has lost its one great object, *viz.*, the extension of the meaning in ver. 4.

It seems best then to accept Braune's view, but with somewhat more definiteness in statement. "The mystery" throughout is one mystery, but in view of the universalism of the Epistle and the current of thought in this section, it here appears as complex, precisely as the notions of "enmity" and "peace" in the preceding section: the mystery of redemption, whose centre is the Person of Christ, whose object and purport is Christ, taking that term as including the Body of which He is the Head, which He has redeemed, and in which the Gentiles are "fellow-members" (*σύσσωμα*, ver. 6); the latter thought being the special reference throughout, though never to the exclusion of the wider thought, since ver. 6 itself with its compounds of *συν* compels us to think of the one inheritance, body and promise which the gospel presents. VAN OESTERZEE well remarks (LANGE'S *Comm.* 1 Tim. iii. 16, p. 47): "Paul knows *one* only great mystery," the chief truth of which as revealed to us is the Person of Christ in its connection with the Body of Christ, as the passage in the Epistle to Timothy itself teaches, and as is not obscurely hinted in v. 32 of our Epistle. With this thought of union as the ruling one, no wonder the special reference to the union of Jews and Gentiles comes in without in the least disturbing or excluding the more general one.—R.]

As I have written afore in few words [*καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ*.—The English perfect brings out the force of the verb best, though it is not a literal rendering. The parenthesis of the E. V. is altogether unnecessary, the linking of clauses by relatives being common in this Epistle.—R.] *Καθώς* indicates that Paul has written only as "it has been made known to him by revelation," of course, from God. This the context demands (vers. 2, 4). This writing has therefore great importance. The verb refers to what is written already. The phrase *ἐν ὀλίγῳ*, *in brief*=*διὰ βραχέων* (CHRYSOSTOM, Heb. xiii. 22); in Plato: *δι' ὀλίγων*, as in 1 Pet. v. 12. The preposition is, at all events, local: in little space=*συντόμως*, Acts xxiv. 4; xxvi. 28 (*ἐν ὀλίγῳ* sc. *χρόνῳ*). *Pauca tantum attigi, cum multa dici possent* (WETSTEIN). Accordingly we must apply it to the whole Epistle up to this point; in comparison with the wealth of the truth revealed, its fulness, its wide-reaching, deep-moving efficiency, what he writes is to him always little and brief. He thus speaks in modesty respecting his writings, not as though the time for a more thorough treatise failed him (SCHENKEL). The reference is to such passages as i. 9 ff.; 17 ff.; ii. 4 ff.; 11 ff., not to one passage especially,* as those expositors must hold, who limit "mystery." Since he is speaking of local precedence alone, not of temporal, "written before" cannot be referred to a *previous* Epistle (CHRYSOSTOM, CALVIN: *ferre omnium consensu*) as *προειρήκαμεν* (Gal. i. 9), *προλέγω*, *προεῖπον* (Gal. v. 21), point to something spoken at a previous time; so 2 Cor. xiii. 2; 1 Thess. iii. 4; *προεγράφη* Rom. xv. 4 must be understood of a prophetic writing with respect to the future. But Rom. iii. 9: *προῃτιασάμεθα*, as in the present instance, relates to what precedes, in the same Epistle. The explanation: *paulo ante* (THEODORET, CALVIN, ESTIUS and others) is incorrect.

Ver. 4. **In accordance with which, while reading, ye can perceive.**—*Πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε—νοῆσαι* must at all events be joined together. *Πρός* with the accusative denotes the measure (Rom. viii. 18) as well as the norm (2 Cor. v. 10; Gal. ii. 14). Comp. WINER, p. 378. The relative *ὃ* refers to what was written briefly before, as the measure by which to reckon, on which to measure; *hoc non refertur præcise ad* PAUCIS, *sed ad totum noëma et πρός notat analogiam ex ungue leonem* (BENGEL). Accordingly it is not to be applied merely to what was written before (MEYER: *προέγραψα*), or to *ἐν ὀλίγῳ* (STIER); nor is it = *prout* (JEROME), nor = *ἐν ᾧ* (KOPPE), nor = *ἐξ οὗ* (FLATT), since what precedes is neither the source or ground, but can only be

* [ALFORD refers it to i. 9 ff., EADIE to ii. 13–22; HODGE and ELLICOTT accept the wider reference. The last author refers *καθώς* to the *fact* that the mystery was made known to the Apostle, not to the manner in which it was made known, but Braune's view seems preferable.—R.]

the measure. [EADIE prefers the sense "in reference to which," but "in accordance with" is adopted by ALFORD, ELLICOTT (whose note *in loco* on this preposition is a marvel of neatness and exactness) and others, favored by HODGE, who adds: "what he had written might be taken as the standard or evidence of his knowledge."—R.]

With δύνασθε (BENGEL: *moderate et liberaliter positum verbum*) Paul refers cautiously to the *ability* which can be affirmed of every one; of the *willingness* he says nothing, that must come in afterwards. Modestly he points to what they can do, leaving to them the doing, neither commanding nor demanding it. The subject is each and all in the Church. Δύνασθε stands first very properly, since it is the emphatic word. The *conditio sine qua non* is indeed ἀναγινώσκοντες, *reading*, while ye read; not *attendentes* (CALVIN). Nor does he say: ἀκούοντες, hearing; he conceives of each one reading for himself. The present tense suggests repeated reading (GROTIUS). To the Greek reading [as the word indicates] was a second perception following the first perception of the author; to the Roman and German the immediate thought is of connecting the letters and joining the words (*legere, lesen*). [The present participle here indicates an act contemporary with that of the perception: *while reading.*—R.] Νοῆσαι is not exactly equivalent to συνιέναι; they differ as do our "perceive" and "understand." Comp. Mark viii. 17; TITTMANN, *Syn.*, I. p. 191. The readers *perceive* that which Paul *understands.* It is not a knowledge possible through reflection (RUECKERT), but a kind of immediate perception (iii. 20; Rom. i. 20; Heb. xi. 3; Matt. xv. 17)*

My understanding in the mystery of Christ.—Τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.—These words are to be taken together as the object of νοῆσαι (MEYER). Σύνεσις used with σοφία (Col. i. 9), has a πληροφορία (Col. ii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 7), is *vox media* (1 Cor. i. 19), and marks an especial knowing, that penetrates and commands its subject, as in the case of a master of the science (Jno. iii. 11). "The mystery of Christ" (Col. iv. 3) is the mystery, which has Christ for its object and purport; Christ Himself is the *concrete* Divine mystery. Col. i. 27 (MEYER, STIER).† It is evident that μυστηρίον is not an absolute secret, since there is an "understanding" with respect to it. See i. 9. BEZA: "*Optimo vero jure de se ista prædicare apostolum, re ipsa cognoscet, quisquis perspexerit, quam sublimiter et prorsus divine totum illud argumentum ab initio epistolæ pertractarit.*" In the connection in which Paul writes, in virtue of his office and by writing labors in and for the Church two things are evident and properly placed together; that he urgently directs the Church to what is written as a standard for their judgment respecting him, as the Apostle, by whom it is said to them, and ascribes to them unconstrained ability and freedom for examination.

Hence the inferences drawn from this passage against the genuineness of the Epistle are inadmissible. It is not necessary that he should refer to his *labors* among them, since his σύνεσις is under discussion, and both the subject-matter itself and his mode of treating it in this Epistle are well adapted to make them aware of this. 1 Cor. xiv. 37; 1 Jno. iv. 6. Comp. Introd. § 5, 2. [See EADIE on the reasons for professing such a knowledge of the mystery. MEYER properly intimates that this verse is worthy of the Apostle (against DE WETTE, SCHWEGLER), and that an imitator would never have written it. In fact an imitator would have probably thought of it as DE WETTE does!—R.]

Ver. 5. *The period and persons concerned in the communication.*—**Which**, ὅ, refers to "the mystery of Christ" (ver. 4), not to "the mystery" (ver. 3); in which case we should have to regard what follows καθώς as a parenthesis (WETSTEIN, [E. V.], and others). [Dr. HODGE seems disposed to regard ver. 4 as a parenthesis, but the relative forms a direct connection. The other construction is an attempt to avoid the difficulty which arises in taking ver. 6 as the purport of the "mystery of Christ."—R.]

In other generations.—The dative ἑτέραις γενεαῖς, is a temporal qualification, which is of very common occurrence; see WINER, p. 205. So ii. 12; Matt. xii. 1: τοῖς σάββασι; Luke xiii. 14: τῷ σαββάτῳ. The word γενεά designates the lineage, the family, Matt. i. 1, 17; also in a spiritual sense, Matt xvii. 17; Mark ix. 19. Then a generation, Matt. xxiv. 34; Luke i. 48; xxi. 32; Phil. ii. 15; and also an age, Acts xiv. 16; xv. 21; Luke i. 50; Col. i. 26 (ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ τῶν γενεῶν); here the temporal idea is the prominent one, only a shorter period of about 33 years is meant. There is no ground for taking it as = time, era (SCHENKEL); and still greater objection to retaining the meaning: lineage, and taking it as an ordinary dative, so that "the sons of men" is an epexegesis, which sets forth *in concreto* what is meant by the "generations" (MEYER). The antithesis "now" demands a temporal definition here. Yet it must be noticed, that the word "generations" is chosen on account of the various stages of revelation to the patriarchs, Moses, David and the prophets.

[MEYER, in his 4th edition, gives up his former opinion, adopting the usual view of our word, mainly on the ground that νῦν requires an antithetical temporal qualification here. Still he correctly insists on the meaning "generations," over against "times" or "periods." HODGE apparently inclines to the earlier view of MEYER.—The word is used in the LXX. to translate the Hebrew word דוֹר, which admits of the temporal signification, now generally attached to γενεαῖς in this passage. ELLICOTT remarks

* [The aorist infinitive, according to DONALDSON (*Grammar*, § 427, 8) "describes a single act either as the completion or as the commencement of a continuity." Hence ALFORD says that here "the act is regarded as one of a series, each of which, when it occurs, is sudden and transitory." Comp. ELLICOTT *in loco*, who does not press the aorist here; and WINER, p. 313, where the idiomatic use of the aorist infinitive after δύναμαι is mentioned. The view of Braune is in any case allowable.—R.]

† [So ALFORD, ELLICOTT and others. EADIE prefers to take the genitive as one of the object, but Braune does so, and yet reaches MEYER's explanation. In any case "the mystery" here refers to the whole wonderful scheme or purpose of Redemption in Christ, of which He is Himself the centre. See note on ver. 3.—R.]

that in one case (Isa. xxiv. 22) even יָמִים is thus rendered.—R.]

Was not made known, *οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη.*—This in distinction from *ἀποκαλύφθη* is something more general and indefinite. BENGEL: *Notificatio per* REVELATIONEM (ver. 3) *est fons notificationis per præconium.* REVELATIO *est quiddam specialius;* NOTIFICATIO *fit ad reliquos etiam auditores,* REVELATIO *tantum ad prophetas.*

To the sons of men, *τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων.*—Only here and in Mark iii. 28. *Latissima appellatio, causam exprimens ignorantiæ, ortum naturarum* (BENGEL, who adds with over-nicety: *de statu vetere loquitur idiotismo linguæ hebraicæ*). The antithesis is found in "His holy apostles and prophets," which moreover compels us to give prominence to the "need of men born of men" (HARLESS), while *ἐν πνεύματι* suggests the lack of the *regeneration,* correlated to *revelation* (STIER); so that under the term בְּנֵי־אָדָם we must include also the Old Testament men of God, such as Abraham (Gal. iii. 8), and even the prophets (Rom. ix. 24-29; xv. 9-12), whom JEROME would exclude. BENGEL, however, is incorrect, when he says: *denotari præcipue* PROPHETAS *antiquos, v. g. Ezechielem, qui sæpe dicitur* בֶּן־אָדָם; thus he is described not as a prophet, but as a man born of men. [EADIE thinks the phrase was suggested by the word *γενεά.* "Sons succeeded fathers, and their sons succeeded them; so that by 'sons of men' is signified the successive band of contemporaries whose lives measured these fleeting *γενεαί.*"—R.]

As it has been now revealed.—Ὡς contrasts now (*νῦν*) and formerly. On account of this *ὡς,* we must take *οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη* as = *οὐχ οὕτως ἐγνωρίσθη,* "*not thus made known,*" and supply here in thought: "through their words and works" (CHRYSOSTOM). Comp. *Doctr. Notes.* It is only asserted that the knowledge of the mystery in former times is not to be regarded as at all equal to the knowledge which now exists; the latter is immeasurably deeper, richer, clearer than the former. It is incorrect to interpret *ὡς* as = while, and to infer that the mystery was not all known before (BLEEK); that cannot be asserted.

His holy apostles and prophets.—The *Apostles* are *ἅγιοι,* because they are Christians; Paul can have no hesitation in affirming of the Apostles, what he had already said of the whole Church (i. 1); of course a higher degree is involved here, especially since they, as well as the Old Testament prophets, who are called "holy," Luke i. 70; Acts iii. 21; 2 Pet. i. 21 (various reading), are termed "prophets." The Apostles also were of themselves naturally only "the sons of men," but like the Christians a holy *ἐκλογή.* "His," according to the context (ver. 2), must be understood of God, and "apostles and prophets," especially on account of the word "now," must be interpreted as in ii. 20. It is incorrect to regard *τοῖς ἁγίοις* as qualified by what follows as an appositional phrase. [So LACHMANN, BISPING].

In the Spirit, *ἐν πνεύματι,* is to be joined with the verb, and defines the modality of the revelation and its communication. It cannot be joined either with "prophets" (CHRYSOSTOM)* or with "holy" (MEIER), still less with what follows (ERASMUS). It is not however = *διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος,* 1 Cor. ii. 10 (LUTHER: *durch den Geist*), [E. V., HODGE, ELLICOTT, MEYER], but denotes the life-sphere, within which the revelation is accomplished: one must live in the Spirit to be a partaker in the revelation. BENGEL: *cujus donum Novo Testamento reservatum ad Christum glorificandum.* The glory of the revelation and the importance of the Apostolic office so overpower Paul here, that he forgets himself altogether.

[OLSHAUSEN: "It is certainly peculiar, that Paul here calls the Apostles, and consequently himself among them, 'holy Apostles.' It is going too far when De Wette finds in this a sign of an unapostolic origin of the Epistle; but still the expression remains an unusual one. I account for it to myself thus—that Paul here conceives of the Apostles and Prophets, as a corporation (comp. iv. 11), and as such, in their official character, he gives them the predicate *ἅγιος,* as he names believers, conceived as a whole, *ἅγιοι* or *ἡγιασμένοι,* but never an individual."—R.]

Ver. 6. *The purport of the mystery.* **That the Gentiles are** (*εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη*).—The infinitive, standing here in emphatic position, is epexegetical of *μυστήριον,* "mystery," hence not to be joined with "revealed" (FLATT), or with "made known," nor is *εἰς τό* to be supplied; and it should not be taken as = *γίνεσθαι.* ["A mystery is not a secret design, but a secret fact" (ALFORD); hence "are," not "should be." So most commentators.—R.]

Fellow-heirs.—*Συγκληρονόμα,* not as in Rom. viii. 17 (*Χριστοῦ*), but "of the saints" (ii. 19), the believing Israel. Comp. i. 14, 18; Gal. iii. 29. *With* the saints they are heirs of God (Rom. viii. 17), as His children. That is the highest privilege.—**Fellow-members** [of the same body].—*Καὶ σύσσωμα* denotes, by means of a peculiarly formed word, the membership in that body, the Head of which is Christ (i. 23; ii. 12, 16).—**Fellow-partakers of the promise,** *καὶ συμμέτοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.* [See *Textual Note* [6].] This denotes participation in the promise (i. 13; ii. 12; Gal. iii. 14), the fulfilment of which is already begun, but by no means completed as yet; *βασιλεία γὰρ ἐπήγγελται παρὰ τοῦ πατρός* (ŒCUMEN.). It refers neither in general to *res* or *bona promissa,* nor in particular to the Holy Ghost alone, as BENGEL, [EADIE] and STIER think, who find a reference to the Head, Christ, in "fellow-members," and to the Father in "fellow-heirs," and thus to the Trinity as in iv. 4-6, 18, 21, 30; v. 1, 2, 18; 2 Cor. xiii. 13. There is as little ground for this as there is indication of a climax (JEROME, PELAGIUS, SCHENKEL: heir, possessor, partaker). For "fellow-heir" comprises the whole, on the ground of the relation to God as a Father, who

* [This is a mistake borrowed from DE WETTE. See ALFORD *in loco.* This view of the connection is that of KOPPE and HOLZHAUSEN. It is admissible enough grammatically, but why define "prophets" by so self-evident a qualification, or distinguish them thus from "apostles;" for the adjective "holy" must then be limited to the latter term.—That the two terms "apostles" and "prophets" refer to the same persons can scarcely be accepted; see on ii. 20.—R.]

has prepared an inheritance for His children; the two added terms respect their relation among each other: the first arising from the relation of the community to which dependence attaches, the other springing directly from the personality regarded as self-inclusive; the first marks the membership in the Church, the relation to it, the second the independence of the individuals, their relation in and of itself. Hence it cannot be said, that what is already sufficiently expressed by the term "fellow-heir," is repeated twice afterwards, once figuratively and the second time literally (MEYER), or that Paul creatively rummaged in the language (KAHNIS), or that the first term contains a personal and substantive reference (HARLESS), which is further indicated by the other two. [ELLICOTT's view resembles that of Braune, but is more clearly expressed: "The general fact of the *συνκληρονομία* is re-asserted, both in its *outward* and *inward* relations. The Gentiles were fellow-heirs with the believing Jews in the most unrestricted sense: they belonged to the same corporate body, the faithful; they shared to the full in the same spiritual blessings: the *ἐπαγγελία*."—R.]

In Christ Jesus through the Gospel.—"In Christ Jesus," defines "are" more closely and, like this, relates to all three of the preceding words. It cannot be joined with "promise" (KOPPE, BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS). Thus Paul indicates that all is communicated only in Him, the God-man. Hence "through the Gospel" is added, in order to point to the means by which that objectively given in Christ, already proffered and prepared, is brought to the individual, is presented for his subjective appropriation. Because Paul is speaking of his office and calling, he must add this also.

The ministry and unworthiness of the recipient; vers. 7, 8 *a*.

Ver. 7. **Whereof I became a minister** [*οὗ ἐγενήθην διάκονος*].—"Whereof" refers to "Gospel" (Col. i. 23, 25).—*Διάκονος* (Col. i. 7) is a synonym of *ὑπηρέτης* (1 Cor. iv. 1; Matt. xxvi. 58; Mark xiv. 54, 65; Jno. vii. 32, 45 f., *etc.*); and according to its etymology (*διὰ—κόνις*,* dust), like the latter (*ὑπὸ—ἐρέτης*, rower), designates a servant of a lower order, while *οἰκόνομος* (1 Cor. iv. 1; Tit. i. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 10) denotes one as related to the property, *συνεργός* (1 Cor. iii. 9; 1 Thess. iii. 2), as related to the works of his Master, *δοῦλος* (vi. 6; Col. iv. 12; Rom. i. 1; vi. 16; 1 Cor. vii. 21; Gal. i. 10; Phil. i. 1), in his dependence on his Master, *λειτουργός* (Rom. xiii. 6; xv. 16) in his devotion. It is incorrect to assert that *διάκονος* describes the servant in his activity for the service, *ὑπερέτης* in that for his Master (HARLESS). [See MEYER and ELLICOTT against HARLESS].—*Ἐγενήθην* marks more strongly than *ἐγενόμην* [*Rec.*] his becoming a servant, refers to a development, even if not as ŒCUMENIUS (*οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐγὼ ἔργον ἐμὸν συνεισήνεγκα τῇ χάριτι ταύτῃ*), RUECKERT and others think; that thought is found in the context, not in the word.

* [According to BUTTMANN (*Lexic.* under the word *διάκτορος*) this word is derived from *διάκω*, or *διηκω*, to hasten. The Ionic form is *διήκονος*, and the *α* is long, hence it is not a compound with *διά*. ELLICOTT refers to Benfey, *Wurzel-lexicon* for remoter difficulties.—R.]

According to the gift of the grace of God [*κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ*].—*Κατά* marks the fact that Paul's becoming a minister of the Gospel had for its norm the grace of God. *Δωρεά* (iv. 7; Rom. v. 17), the single gift, like *δῶρον* (ii. 8), marks the free present. "The grace of God" sets forth the nature, purport of the gift. [The genitive is one of apposition or identity; the grace *was* the gift.—R.] LUTHER accordingly is incorrect: according to the gift out of grace, as if this were the source, the dispenser, while the gift itself was something else, such as the gift of tongues (GROTIUS), the Holy Ghost (A-LAPIDE, FLATT). It is in accordance with the context to think of the Apostolic office [HODGE, EADIE]; but the grace of God, which Paul had received, prepared him for this; He cannot use for His service persons as they are. He must convert and transform them for this end (ii. 10).

Which was given to me.—TISCHENDORF retains *τὴν δοθεῖσαν* in spite of the *Cod. Sin.* [See *Textual Note* [9]. The received reading makes "given" agree with "gift;" the other with "grace," the sense being the same in either case.—R.]

According to the working of his power [*κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ*].—"According to the working" (i. 19) marks that the gift has been bestowed, not according to the receptivity of the recipient, but according to the efficiency of the Giver. [This prepositional clause depends on *τῆς δοθείσης μοι*, defining the mode of giving. This justifies the seeming tautology: "the gift given to me." MEYER, whom ELLICOTT cites in favor of connecting the phrase with the leading verb, now adopts this simpler view. Dr. HODGE accepts without remark the incorrect rendering of the E. V., which, not content with the instrumental sense it imposes so frequently on *ἐν*, here gives *κατά* the same sense: *by*.—R.] "Of His power" gives prominence to God's power, and throws Paul's person into the back-ground; yet recalls the fact, as he himself does in ver. 8, that it is precisely the persecutor who has become an Apostle, the narrow-minded, proud Pharisee who has been transformed into the most large-hearted and humble servant of the Gospel to the Gentiles (STIER). CALVIN: *In hoc dono prædicat Dei potentiam, ac si diceret: nolite respicere, quid sim meritus, quia dominus ultro mihi sua liberalitate hoc contulit, ut sim apostolus gentium, non mea, dignitate, sed ejus gratia. Nolite etiam respicere qualis fuerim; nam domini est, homines nihili extollere. Hæc est potentiæ ejus efficacia, ex nihilo grande aliquid efficere*

Ver. 8. **To me, who am less than the least,** *ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ*.—The pronoun in the dative stands first, somewhat remarkably; we might rather expect: *αὕτη ἡ χάρις ἐδόθη τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων*, this very grace is grace to less than the least of all. But the pronoun refers to ver. 1, and must be joined with it. It is scarcely possible that after the grammatical and logical conclusion of the sentence begun in ver. 1 (ver. 7: *τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ*) another entirely new sentence should begin in ver 8, only to introduce a parenthetical thought, es-

pecially as the sentence closes with ver. 12, beyond which the supposed parenthesis must be continued. [The objections to this view of the connection will be found in my note at the close of ver. 1. Dr. Braune's difficulty suggested above is not so singular in a writer like Paul as the resumption by means of a dative. As regards the logical connection, ELLICOTT remarks: "No addition was required to the former period; the great Apostle however so truly, so earnestly felt his own weakness and nothingness (2 Cor. xii. 11), that the mention of God's grace towards him awakens within, by the forcible contrast it suggests, not only the remembrance of his former persecutions of the Church (1 Cor. xv. 9, 10), but of his own sinful nature (1 Tim. i. 15) and unworthiness for so high an office." The transition always seems natural to one who is familiar with Paul's modes of thought.—R.]

STIER attempts to transfer the double comparative into the German: *dem Gerinsteren.* BENGEL: *Notio nominis* PAULUS *cumulata per comparativum superlativo superiorem; quo se sanctis vix accenset; elegantissima modestia.* A similar double comparative is found in 3 Jno. 4: *μειζοτέραν.* Comp WINER, p. 67, where he compares the Latin *minimissimus, pessimissimus.* [To this we may add *excelsior,* now almost naturalized in English; a word constructed precisely like Paul's double comparative. The rendering of the E. V. cannot be improved.—R.] Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 9: *ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων.* Here he cannot sufficiently express himself; here he speaks of the service of the Gospel in general. Accordingly he adds:

Of all saints, *πάντων ἁγίων, i. e.* Christians; he does not say of "Apostles," nor yet "of men," two interpretations, the latter of which is designed to exclude angels, without any ground. According to Phil. iii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 13, Paul's persecution of the Church of Christ is the strongest expression of sin in him, so that, according to the context, compared with all Christians, he regards himself as the most unworthy, because he is conscious of his sin and guilt, feeling that since God's grace has helped him, there is no one whom it cannot and may not help.

Was this grace given, *ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη.*—This is the grace which lies at the foundation of his vocation as Apostle (STIER), not the Apostolic office itself (RUECKERT).—*Αὕτη,* "this," points forward to what follows, which sets forth wherein this grace consists. What he has set forth in ver. 6 as the purport of the mystery, as the mission of the Apostles in general, he now represents as that which is committed to him. There is not therefore here a parenthesis and exclamation of joy: "to me less than the least, is this grace given!" so that what follows is to be joined with "gift," ver. 7 (HARLESS); for vers. 2-12 do not form an interpolation, but the sentence begun in ver. 1 is entirely broken off, and *αὕτη* does not refer to what precedes, nor is ii. 6 to be compared with this construction.

The magnitude of the mission; vers. 8 *b,* 9.

Ver. 8 *b.* **To preach to the Gentiles** [*τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι.*—"An explanatory and partly appositional clause," ELLICOTT.—R.] The infinitive here sets forth the mission of the gift of grace, as in ver. 6 it indicated the purport of the mystery. See WINER, p. 298. The dative, which in accordance with the context stands first for emphasis, is a more difficult reading than if *ἐν* were inserted, as in Gal. i. 16. [See *Textual Note* [10].] Yet to Paul was committed the task of preaching to the Gentiles (Gal. i. 16; ii. 8; 1 Tim. ii. 7; Acts ix. 15; xxii. 21; xxvi. 17), not merely *among* the Gentiles; he should do what he could, the completed solution of the problem belongs to God.

The unsearchable riches of Christ, *τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.*—THEODORET is excellent: *καὶ πῶς κηρύττεις, εἴπερ ὁ πλοῦτος ἀνεξιχνίαστος; Τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτο, φησι, κηρύττω, ὅτι ἀνεξιχνίαστος.* Rom. xi. 32. "Of Christ" is not an abbreviated form for the grace, the goodness of Christ, but refers rather to the fulness of the glory (HARLESS). [ALFORD: "The fulness of wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption—all centred and summed up in Him."—R.] BUCER: *Jam evangelium exponit investigabiles divitias Christi, non illas quidem, quas nemo nostrum percipere potest, sic enim frustra prædicaretur nobis evangelium; sed quod quisque pro modulo dono suo tantum percipiat opum cœlestium, quantum ad salutem, consequendam satis est.* There is ever indeed an immeasurable remainder, and poor needy souls seek in vain to exhaust it (*Berlenburger Bible*). Comp. ver. 19; 1 Cor. xiii. 9-12. [Exhaustless "both in its nature, extent and application" (ELLICOTT).—R.]

Ver. 9. **And to make all see,** *καὶ φωτίσαι πάντας.*—This adds to "preach," a further task of the Apostle, which is accomplished by means of the preaching of the gospel; what the gospel can do (2 Cor. iv. 4: *τὸν φωτισμον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*) this the evangelizing Apostle effects, whose word enlightens as a "word of prophecy," which is a "light shining in a dark place" (2 Pet. i. 19). He is bidden "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light" (Acts xxvi. 18). See i. 18; Heb. vi. 4; x. 32; Ps. cxix. 130. The object is "all," which according to the context, means the Gentiles hearing him; there is no reference to the Jews (PELAGIUS, HARLESS, STIER), since *πάντας,* "all," following the emphatic *τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* (ver. 8) cannot receive any emphasis. Since, however, no such accusative as "eyes" is added, the verb "enlighten" refers to the whole man, spirit, heart, conscience, not merely to the perceptive faculty (SCHENKEL), nor is it = *docere* (BENGEL). It is more than "make known," almost equivalent to *ἀποκάλυψις,* revelation (STIER).* As to what he enlightens the Gentiles then follows:

What is the dispensation of the mystery, *τίς ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου.*—See on i. 9, 10. The "mystery" here is not merely the calling of the Gentiles (ver. 6), but as in ii. 3; here "the actual accomplishment of the plan hitherto formed in secret" (STIER) is treated of. [HODGE favors the same view. ELLICOTT:

* [ALFORD: "Not merely externally to teach, referred to *his work*—but internally to enlighten the hearers, referred to their *apprehension.*" HODGE takes the verb as equivalent to "teach;" EADIE is much better.—R.]

"The dispensation (arrangement, regulation) of the mystery (the union of Jews and Gentiles in Christ, ver. 6), which was to be humbly traced and acknowledged in the fact of its having secretly existed in the primal counsels of God, and now having been revealed to the heavenly powers by means of the Church." So MEYER, ALFORD and most. See on ver. 3, however. —R.]

Which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God who created all things [*τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τά πάντα κτίσαντι*].—*Τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμένου* is like *σεσιγημένου*, Rom. xvi. 25; comp. 1 Cor. ii. 7; Col. i. 26. It has been hid *ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων* (Col. i. 26; = *ἀπ' αἰῶνος*, Luke i. 70; Acts iii. 21: *ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος*, Jno. ix. 32), since the ages, from the beginning of the same; since there were men and angels, it has been revealed to none of them; before that there was no one, from whom it could be hid (MEYER). It was concealed "in God who created all things." Thus God is marked as the Creator of the universe with all that therein is, of heaven and earth. BENGEL: *Antitheton ad creaturas, etiam excellentissimas*, ver. 10. There is no ground for limiting "all things," and referring it either to the *moral* creation* (CALVIN, GROTIUS, MORUS, and others), which is forbidden both by the meaning of the word and by the aorist (*κτίσας*), or to the moral world (HOLZHAUSEN). Evidently, however, Redemption and creation are thus placed in relation and connection with each other; BENGEL takes the latter as *fundamentum omnis reliquiæ œconomiæ, pro protestate Dei universali liberrimæ dispensatæ;* STIER regards the former as *fundamentum creationis rerum omnium*, even of angels. We can and must join together Creation and Redemption, as decrees, dare not separate them, even though the act of creation self-evidently precedes the act of Redemption and the acts of revelation, and is ordered with a view to these.

[The only question that arises in regard to this passage is this, Why is the creation introduced in this connection? HODGE deems it a mere expression of reverence, but this is unsatisfactory. ALFORD thinks the fact here expressed "involves His perfect right to adjust all things as He will," thus the concealment is justified (so RUECKERT). To this MEYER properly objects, that there is no logical connection of this kind, and ELLICOTT says: "A reference to God's omniscience would more suitably have justified the concealment." OLSHAUSEN's view, that Redemption is itself a creative act seems equally irrelevant. It is either added to enhance the idea of God's omnipotence (ELLICOTT), or better with MEYER, EADIE, and others, to indicate that God in creating the world included in His purpose and arrangement that development which forms the purport of the mystery.—R.]

The end with a glance at the final cause and also at the present; vers. 10-12.

Ver. 10. **To the intent that now,** *etc.*—Upon what *ἵνα* depends will be best determined after the whole verse has been explained. *Γνωρισθῇ νῦν* is the order in the Greek, hence the former word is emphatic and corresponds with "hath been hid," just as "now" does with "from the beginning." Comp. WINER, p. 269. [We might render: "In order that there might be made known now," (the last word having a secondary emphasis).—R.]

Unto the principalities and powers, *ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις.*—Thus the objects, to which it is made known, are marked as of importance. See i. 21. [The repetition of the article adds solemnity without distinguishing two classes.—R.]

In the heavenly places, *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*, describes them more closely as to locality (comp. i. 3); hence they are not earthly and human, either heathen priests, Jewish rulers or Christian church authorities, but angels, and good angels, who desire to look into these things (1 Pet. i. 12). CALVIN: *Quid enim egregium de evangelio prædicaret apostolus aut de gentium vocatione, si nunc primum diabolus innotuisse diceret?* The context does not permit us to apply the terms to bad angels (AMBROSIASTER), nor even to consider them as included (BENGEL, OLSHAUSEN, HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, I. p. 361 f., BLEEK), since it treats of a designed making known of the wisdom of God to His praise.* That Paul did not concisely say "angels," arises from the fact that here, as in i. 21, he wishes to give prominence to their power and elevation, here to glorify the Church, as there to glorify Christ, hence the agency of angels in the world of nations is not indicated (HOFMANN). In order to mark that a *cosmical* relation is under discussion here as in i. 10, the "powers" are termed *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.* This added phrase is so joined with "principalities and powers" as to form a single conception; hence does not indicate the modality of the verb "made known" (MATTHIES). This is done by the next phrase.

Through the church, *διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.*—This is the theatre of the glory of God, of the Divine works (BENGEL), see 1 Cor. iv. 9. It is a communion in heaven and on earth, the militant and triumphant church, and as such an object of interest to the good angels (Matth. xviii. 10; Luke xv. 7, 10; 1 Cor. xi. 10; Heb. i. 14). LUTHER renders: *an die Gemeinde*, on the church, which does not accurately present the means employed, as it makes of the church only an object of observation or a place of instruction, while the preposition *διά* presents it as an instructress, who makes known, not in words indeed, but by acts, conduct and character.

The manifold wisdom of God, *ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ.*—*Ποικίλος* occurs with *νόσοις*, Matth. iv. 24; Mark i. 34; Luke iv. 40, with *ἐπιθυμίαις* 2 Tim. iii. 6, with *ἡδοναῖς* Tit. iii. 3, with *δυνάμεσι* Heb. ii. 4, with *διδαχαῖς* Heb. xiii. 9, with *πειρασμοῖς* Jas. i. 2: 1 Pet. i. 6, with *χάριτος* 1 Pet. iv. 10; iii. 7 (various reading) and means "various;" so that the special word *πολυποίκιλος*, occurring only here means multifarious, strengthening the idea of "manifold." Accordingly it cannot be = very wise (KOPPE),

* [The correct reading takes away the only support which this view could have from text or context.—R.]

* [A reference to both classes is excluded "not so much by *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*, as by the general tenor of the passage; evil angels more naturally recognize the *power*, good angels the *wisdom* of God" (ELLICOTT).—R.]

nor mean merely the wisdom which adjusts the antagonism between law and grace (HARLESS), but it refers "to those wondrous ways operating on the Church" of that God "who imparts reconcilation and actually edifies the church" (so STIER, who incorrectly limits it to the Holy Ghost), to the different treatment of different men, the various means He employs, so that He is "to each eternally another and yet to each eternally the same" (LAVATER). Rom. xi. 33, 34. The "wisdom" is indeed one, it is only its manifestation that is so manifold (ANSELM); certainly it is not that of Gnosticism (BAUR). What is said of the Old Testament in Heb. i. 1 ("sundry times and divers mannners") is true in the highest degree of the New Testament economy.

[ALFORD: "It is all *one* in sublime unity of truth and purpose: but cannot be apprehended by finite minds in this its unity, and therefore is by Him variously portioned out to each finite race and finite capacity of individuals—so that the Church is a mirror of God's wisdom—chromatic, so to speak, with the rainbow colors of that light which in itself is one and undivided." ELLICOTT: "The variety of the Divine counsels, which nevertheless all mysteriously co-operated toward a single end—the call of the Gentiles, and salvation of mankind by faith in Jesus Christ." "That the holy angels are capable of a specific increase of knowledge, and of a deepening insight into God's wisdom, seems from this passage clear and incontrovertible."—R.]

It is evident then that this clause of design depends with its ἵνα on the clause: "What is the dispensation of the mystery." The arrangement, management and guidance of this edifice (οἶκον νέμειν) is of precisely that kind (τίς), so planned, that (ἵνα) through the church as a collection of believing saints out of every land and condition the wisdom of God should in continued acts become perceptible and manifest to the participant and active angelic world in the most multifarious manner; that is the purpose of the "dispensation of the mystery, which from the beginning hath been hid in God who created all things." The mystery has not been hid from the ages, in order that God's wisdom might be revealed later (MEYER, SCHENKEL, [EADIE] BLEEK), nor has God created all things, that this might be made known through the Church (HARLESS); this purpose and design does not form a closer definition of "mystery" nor of "God," but of His "economy." Nor is the ground of this purpose found in the task set before the Apostle Paul (STIER), his preaching and enlightening, but in that which he has to preach and about which he has to enlighten, which remains after him and his labor, upon which he entered as fellow-laborer; hence in the economy of God itself.

[This view of Braune is certainly plausible, but it is not preferable to that which he mentions last, *viz.*, that this verse is joined with the "preaching" and "enlightening" of vers. 8, 9 (so OLSHAUSEN, DE WETTE, HOFMANN, HODGE, ELLICOTT, ALFORD, who however thinks the reference is to ἐδόθη, if one word must be singled out). The objection that this ascribes too much to Paul's own preaching (MEYER) is scarcely valid in view of the current of thought and the fact that the "manifold wisdom" did manifest itself through the preaching of the Apostle to the Gentiles. OLSHAUSEN: "Paul contrasts the greatness of his vocation with his personal nothingness, and he therefore traces the design of his mission through different steps. First, he says, he had to preach to the heathen; then to enlighten all concerning the mystery; and both, in order to manifest even to angels the infinite wisdom of God."—To take ἵνα as ecbatic is altogether inadmissible. The connection with "created" is accepted by some who adopt the longer reading and refer this then to the moral creation. HARLESS however adopts the same connection in a supralapsarian sense. As this is the only passage in the New Testament which can be made to assert this view, it may be here remarked: (1.) This is singular and involves a theory of creation which, however logical, becomes too terrific to be admitted on the strength of a doubtful exegesis. (2.) It joins a marked final clause to a participle which depends on another participle which depends on an infinitive which depends on a leading verb. (3.) The *present* manifestation is the end of a present operation, *viz.*, the preaching and making known. (4.) The end of creation is distinctly stated in Col. i. 16 to be the personal Christ: εἰς αὐτόν, "unto Him," as *causa finalis*, "all things were created."—R.]

Ver. 11. **According to the eternal purpose,** κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰώνων, evidently defines "might be made known," not "manifold" (ANSELM), nor "wisdom" (KOPPE), certainly not vers. 3 and 5 (FLATT). The making known takes place according to the purpose "before the foundation of the world" (i. 3). The genitive marks the relation to the ages, that this purpose will be retained during these, will remain in force and regulate them. Col. i. 20: αἷμα τοῦ σταυροῦ, 2 Cor. xi. 26: κίνδυνοι ποταμῶν are similar; see WINER, p. 176. [ALFORD: "The genitive is apparently one of time, as when we say it has been an opinion of years:" "The duration all that time giving the αἰῶνες a kind of possession. If so, the sense is best given in English by '*eternal*,' as in E. V." ELLICOTT: "The purpose which pertained to, existed in, was determined on in the ages." Two things we may hold fast to: (1.) The general correctness of the rendering "eternal." (2.) The utter groundlessness of any Gnostic reference.—R.]

Which he wrought in Christ Jesus.—Ἣν ἐποίησεν refers of course to πρόθεσιν, not to σοφία (LUTHER: which He has shown), nor to ἐκκλησία (ERASMUS): Πρόθεσιν ποιεῖν means either to *form* a purpose (Rev. xvii. 17; γνώμην ποιεῖν, Mark xv. 1: συμβούλιον ποιεῖν), or to *execute* one. The context points to the carrying out, which is however just begun: the mystery has already become clear in the gospel, it is no longer as before, and ver. 12, with its emphatic "we have," gives prominence to the present time. Hence it is incorrect to render: "which He purposed" (CALVIN, RUECKERT, HARLESS, HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, 1, p. 230); in that case we would find the verb in the middle voice (ἐποιήσατο), which is

used in a periphrasis like this (WINER, p. 240).* To combine the two (STIER) is altogether improper; we must choose one or the other.—"In" denotes, that *outside* of Him who existed before all (Χριστῷ) and has now become incarnate (Ἰησοῦ) and *without* Him God's purpose is not accomplished.

The added: **Our Lord,** τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, pointing to the time of His appearing, is added on account of the ἐκκλησία, the ἡμῶν, whose Head and Lord is Jesus the Christ. [ALFORD is forced by his view of the verb to apply the whole to Christ in His pre-existence, which is very unusual.—R.] It is now explicable why the angels through such a church obtain wider knowledge of God's wisdom. At the same time the phrase introduces what follows.

Ver. 12. **In whom we have,** ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν.—[The relative has here a slightly demonstrative and explanatory force (MEYER, ELLICOTT).—R.] Here "we" evidently means those who are really in Him; our fellowship with Him is the fundamental thought. For the gifts which are afterwards mentioned, do not inhere in Him, as do Truth, Love, Life, but are states of mind resulting from fellowship with Him or ripened relations.

Our boldness and our access in confidence [τὴν παῤῥησίαν καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐν πεποιθήσει. See *Textual Note* [13].]—On the first term see my remarks on Jno. ii. 28, LANGE'S *Comm.*, p. 82.† It is used by Paul besides in vi. 19; Col. ii. 15; Phil. i. 20; 2 Cor. iii. 12; vii. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 13; Philem. 8; and is found in Heb. iii. 6; iv. 16; x. 19, 35. Here it means the free, joyous spirit of the redeemed, and must not be limited either to *libertas dicendi* (VATABLE), or to prayer (BENGEL). Καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐν πεποιθήσει, "our access in confidence," forms a single conception; the last term is not to be joined with "boldness;" for that does not require as a closer definition what it has essentially in itself. "Access" (ii. 18) however requires it, since this may be feeble, timid, anxious, uncertain of acceptance.‡ The "confidence" (πεποίθησις, only in Phil. iii. 4; 2 Cor. i. 15; iii. 4; viii. 22; x. 2), which expresses itself after the boldness (comp. Rom. viii. 38, 39 with 31-37), is the childlike confidence in which the subject of grace approaches God. The phrase, therefore, is not to be joined with "we have" (MEYER, SCHENKEL). [The latter view of the connection is adopted by ELLICOTT and ALFORD. While the other is admissible, there seems to be a gain in thought from joining it with the verb; see below —R.]

Through our faith in Him [διὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ].—The preposition marks that by means of which the fellowship we have with Him is brought about, and is a closer definition of ἔχομεν, "we have." Τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ (only in iv. 13) like Rom. iii. 22, Gal. iii. 22, means faith on Him, *viz.*, on Him, in whom "we have," *etc.*, on "Christ Jesus our Lord" (ver. 11). This faith is the subjective means of the union and the continued fellowship (Rom. v. 1, 2). [ELLICOTT taking "in confidence" as a predication of manner defining the tone and frame of mind in which the "access" is enjoyed and realized, makes the following distinctions between the three qualifying phrases: "in whom" makes the objective ground of the possession, "through our faith in Him" the subjective medium *by which*, and "in confidence" the subjective state *in which* it is apprehended. EADIE: "That faith whose object is Jesus is the means to all who are Christ's, first, of 'boldness,' for their belief in the Divine Mediator gives them courage; secondly of 'access,' for their realization of His glorified humanity warrants and enables them to approach the throne of grace; and thirdly these blessings are possessed 'in confidence,' for they feel that for Christ's sake their persons and services will be accepted by the Father."—R.]

Ver. 13. *Conclusion.* **Wherefore I beseech** διὸ αἰτοῦμαι:—This refers to ver. 12 ("we have our boldness and our access"); he proves this in petition, of course, to God. [See below however.] The middle voice, upon which however too great stress must not be laid (Col. i. 9; Jas. i. 6), denotes the praying for himself

[The reference seems rather to be to the whole paragraph: "Since I am the appointed minister of so great a matter" (ALFORD; so EADIE, ELLICOTT and now MEYER). The other view is perfectly grammatical, but joins this verse to a secondary thought, while the wider reference brings us back, as if the steps were being retraced, to ver. 1: "the prisoner of Jesus Christ in behalf of you Gentiles," the next verse passing further back to "for this cause."—R.]

Not to faint, μὴ ἐγκακεῖν.—[Dr. Braune's rendering is: I pray (God) not to become dispirited, *i. e.*, that I become not dispirited; others I pray (God) that you faint not; while most accept the view which supplies ὑμᾶς as the object of the verb and the subject of the infinitive:

* [ALFORD supports the sense: "constituted," urging that Paul would have used a more definite verb to express the idea of executing the purpose, and further that the aorist seems to point back to a definite act of origination, while the perfect would better express the continued execution. The latter remark has some force, but does not outweigh the arguments supporting the other sense: (1) That the name of "Jesus," the historical Saviour, follows immediately; (2) that the next verse is an explanatory confirmation of the *accomplished*, not the *purposed* design (MEYER). It may be added that this meaning is more common in the New Testament (ii. 3; Matth. xxi. 31; John vi. 38; 1 Thess. v. 24 and elsewhere) than the other, which occurs only in Mark xv. 1; Rev. xvii. 17 (not Acts xvii. 17, as Braune has it in the German, repeating a typographical error, which has been allowed to remain in several editions of MEYER). Notwithstanding WINER'S distinction, in neither case do we find the middle. ELLICOTT properly renders the verb: *wrought*, instead of using the too definite "fulfilled." In support of Braune's view, the following names may be mentioned: THEODORET, GROTIUS, OLSHAUSEN, DE WETTE, MEYER, CONYBEARE, ELLICOTT, HODGE, EADIE.—R.]

† [Dr. Braune there refers to the mistaken conception of the term arising from one of those etymological jumbles so common in all languages. The sense is *Freimüthigkeit*; Luther however rendered it *Freydigkeit*, *Freidigkeit* (derived from *frei*, free). This was soon confounded with *Freudigkeit, freudig*, joyful); a sense which has influenced English commentators as well. The joyous element is present indeed, but not so prominent as this mistake has made it.—R.]

‡ [ELLICOTT clings to the transitive meaning here also, though admitting some uncertainty in regard to it. The union with "boldness" requires the transitive sense. "We may confidently say, that so important an objective truth as our introduction to God by Christ would never have been thus coupled to a mere subjective quality in ourselves" (ALFORD). Still it is not so purely subjective as "boldness."—R.]

"I beseech you not to faint." See below.—R.] The subject according to the context, especially "in my tribulations," is the Apostle. It is precisely the result of his prayer to God and his intercourse with Him that he is courageous and in high-hearted joy even in tribulations.—**In my tribulations for you** [ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσίν μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν].—The word θλίψις definitely shows that the subject is the Apostle; so does the expression ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, which is to be closely joined with θλίψεσίν μου. Accordingly Paul does not ask the readers not to faint (*Vulgate*, LUTHER, MEYER, BLEEK, and many others), but prays to God for himself.

[This view of the verse is supported by such able commentators as BENGEL, RUECKERT, HARLESS (who however altogether unwarrantably joins ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν with αἰτοῦμαι) OLSHAUSEN, TURNER, BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS, and is favored by the *Syriac* version, THEODORET and JEROME. Still the majority of commentators from CHRYSOSTOM to the latest English expositors, reject it. With good reason too, for (1.) it seems unpauline to insert such a prayer here; he rejoiced in suffering (Col. i. 29) and gloried in infirmity (2 Cor. xi. 30), and was speaking of high privilege little likely to suggest faint-heartedness in himself. (2.) The next clause presents, a motive (MEYER), which is irrelevant if the prayer is for himself. (3.) Notwithstanding Braune's remark, μου would be superfluous in that case. (4.) Grammatically it is far simpler to supply ὑμᾶς as the object of the finite verb and the subject of the infinitive, than to supply θεόν as the object and then ἐμέ as subject-accusative; two words necessary to define the thought would scarcely be omitted, and the view we oppose necessarily requires two different words. If, as is natural, only one is to be supplied, that one must be ὑμᾶς.—Ἐν therefore denotes the sphere in which the faint-heartedness of the Ephesians might possibly be shown (ELLICOTT); the article is not necessary before ὑπέρ, since the close connection of thought is similar to that in ver. 1: "prisoner for you Gentiles."—R.]

Which are your glory [ἥτις ἐστὶ δόξα ὑμῶν].—Ἥτις put for αἵτινες by the attraction δόξα ὑμῶν (WINER, pp. 157, 505). The tribulations of the Apostle for the church are the honor, fame and glory of the same; it would be a detriment, distress and disgrace to the church, to have a founder and leader, who in tribulations became discouraged and despondent; but they confess a faith, for the proclamation of which the Apostles must bear heavy sorrow, yet compared with which sorrows are not to be dreaded, and they have a leader, whom they may joyously and confidently follow. This clause is not to be referred to "faint not" (HARLESS, SCHENKEL and others), nor is it to be left indefinite in an oratorical sense (RUECKERT). It is thus that he prays first for himself (ver. 13) and then (ver. 14) for the Ephesians (RHENFERD). Thus he closes the section concerning himself and his office, in order to pass to a supplication for the church.

[The reference of this clause to "tribulations" is to be maintained and is best indicated by restoring the plural form in English: which are (seeing that they are) your glory. The view of Braune stands or falls with that taken of the former part of the verse. It must be apparent that the other explanation is more satisfactory here. ELLICOTT well remarks too: "Glory accrued to the Ephesians from the official dignity, not the personal dignity of the sufferer." Both because God so loved them as to give His Son first, and then to send His servants to suffering, (CHRYSOSTOM) and because these tribulations were the tokens of the freedom of the gospel (EADIE), are these "your glory." He has now returned to his starting-point (ver. 1), and resumes the thought there broken off in ver. 14.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The idea of substitution* is more *ethical* than doctrinal, and finds a sphere in the whole human life, in its narrowest and widest circles. The Apostle suffers for his Church; his suffering is for her advantage. So the child lives at the expense of its parents; the child for whom no one suffers is a miserable creature, and the parents who do not suffer for their child, nor take sorrow on themselves to avert them from their offspring, are no true parents. So benefactors suffer for their wards, and suffering for them, remove their pain and need. So the shepherds of the people. The suffering of human life is in its widest range *vicarious*. Where this really exists, without some subtle selfishness, there it is without vanity, desire to please, ambition or vain-glory, there, just as one does his duty to his neighbor, faithful in the least, does he also bear and with joy *dares* suffer! And it is just he who has felt the truth of the vicarious sufferings of Jesus Christ, who can thus do. The Romanists acknowledge such vicarious suffering only in the case of the saints, we find it in all departments of our social life. As Paul was a martyr, so is every teacher, every mother. But they are only martyrs, *i. e.*, witnesses of the everlasting mercy and the everlasting redemption, Christ Jesus is the author of redemption, the mediator of mercy.

2. *The official service in the Church.* On this subject this section contains important suggestions of various kinds.

a. First of all Paul feels that he is "the prisoner of Christ Jesus:" he has orders, powers, duties, rights and authority *from the Master; quum verbum Christi—porrigunt* (*ministri*), *Christi vice et loco porrigunt* (*Apology Aug. Conf. Art.* vii. viii. § 28), *non repræsentant suam personam* (the same, § 47).

b. The office is a *gift of grace* (vers. 2, 7); *beneficium seu gratia, non judicium seu lex* (*Apology*, vi. § 6); it stands and falls with the church, so that "a priority attaches neither to the church before the office, nor to the office before the church; rather the office has never existed without the church, as the church has never existed without the office" (HARNACK, *Die Kirche, ihr Amt, ihr Regiment*, § 41).

c. The office must be distinguished from the *general calling of Christians* as a special call of the church, but not separated from it ("less than the least of all saints," ver. 8); there is no specific difference, and the ministers of the church remain members of the body of Christ,

just as the private Christian does; both belong together and are included in the organism of the church. Hence the communicative "we have" (ver. 12). Here however is the distinction of the New Testament office, that it is not united with a class, family, or with definite persons, like that of the Old Testament. It is filled from among the "saints."

d. In its *nature* the office is a *διακονία* (ver. 7: *οὐ ἐγενόμην διάκονος*), *ministerium*, not a lordship; the free inquiry of the individual member in private must not be abridged (ver. 4). "For the Apostles did not receive *a mandatum cum libera*, *i. e.*, an entirely free and unlimited authority and power, but a certain [*i. e.*, definite] authority (*Apology*, xlv. § 18).

e. The gift of this office is God's Word, and its *task* is the preaching of the same: "Gospel" (ver. 6), "to preach to the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, to make all see what is the dispensation of the mystery" (vers. 8, 9); hence we must not preach our own words! So far it is *juris Divini*, belonging to the economy of salvation as a continuation of the apostolic ministry; not however of the *apostolate** with apostolic dignity and authority, for the Apostles as persons *have no successors.* For this office too we must distinguish the empirical establishment of church offices, which is a matter of ecclesiastical regulation and *juris humani.* [These principles are of great importance, but the trouble has been that "ecclesiastical regulation" exalted itself to such a degree as to assert for its creatures the *jus Divinum.*—R.]

f. The *equipment* for and in this office is the work of the Holy Ghost, who vouchsafes the "revelation" (ver. 3), in whom the mystery is revealed (ver. 5), who furnishes the necessary "knowledge" (ver. 4).

g. Oral preaching and the Holy Scriptures belong together ("ye have heard," ver. 2; "when ye read," ver. 4) in the Apostle's method, just as the congregation should hear and read, both in public and in private.

h. This office lays claim to the *person* of the minister, not merely to his strength and his time; the office is not conferred upon him just as he is; it does not make demands upon him merely when an official discharge of duty is concerned. Hence the Apostle says: "I became" (ver. 7), "the grace to God which was given to me (vers. 2, 7, 8)" according to the working of his power (ver. 7), so that he who is "less than the least" (ver. 8) has still "boldness" and "access with confidence" (ver. 12). [Comp. here the note of EADIE, p. 231, from BAXTER's *Reformed Pastor.*—R.]

3. As regards Revelation, Paul only declares, that it was *actually* the possession of himself and the Apostles (ver. 3, 5). We find moreover at the same time an expression of the necessity of revelation: "the mystery" would never have become "the gospel," had the Apostles been wanting in that understanding and clearness necessary to preach and explain the mystery. Evidently the personal intercourse of the Apostles with the Lord was not sufficient for this purpose, they needed the revealing Spirit, just as Paul required the appearance of the Lord. Nothing is said respecting the *mode* of revelation in the Apostles, except that it did not consist in a single act, but in a continuous one, which could have its pauses and its ebbings, but never ceased entirely. In the church however, it is plainly stated (ver. 6), the revelation respecting the "mystery" is mediated "through the gospel," and is therefore joined with the words of the preached gospel.

4. Hence there results the duty of the private Christian, neither to absent himself from the common public service, so that he may hear, nor to neglect private closet worship, so as to read. Upon this is based the obligation of the church to circulate the Scriptures through the agency of Bible Societies, and the crime of the Roman pontiff in forbidding and hindering this. * "The old complaint continues still: *sed nos non habemus aures, sicût Deus linguam* (STIER).

5. *The difference in the Holy Scriptures.* Old and New Testament, are defined in ver. 5, very much according to the saying of Augustine; *et in vetere novum latet, et in novo vetus patet.* Both treat of the "mystery," which is the purport of the gospel, as it was the subject of prophecy. The difference is only in clearness respecting this; the former lacks it, the latter possesses it. In the former the full universal idea of the gospel lies hidden, as, in a bud, in enigmatical visions and figures. The hope of the Old Testament prophets had not that clearness of understanding which belongs to the New Testament Apostles and congregations, but the intensity of the consciousness of salvation and of the sense of God's mercy was not less then than afterwards, hence not less perfect in itself, only less distinct in form and expression; so that we may in the light of the gospel and the adult church understand the prophets of the Old Testament better than they did themselves, and yet be not more perfect than they. Hence we can only say with JEROME: *aliud est in spiritu ventura cognoscere, aliud ea cernere opera completa*, or with CALOVIUS: *distinguendum inter cognitionem generalem et specialem.* The contrast of the Old and New Testament is not under discussion, as HARLESS remarks, but that bestowal of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, which introduced them into the entire already existing truth of redemption, and which was accordingly something actually different from the previous inspiration.

6. Carefully as the Apostle demands the reading of what he has written (ver 4: "while reading," *etc.*), he yet places it before them as a measure and norm ("in accordance with which"). The *preached* word, when written, became yet more objective and permanent, as a

* [HODGE: "You could no more appoint a man an Apostle, than you could appoint him a saint. Neither inspiration nor holiness come by appointment. An Apostle without inspiration is as much a solecism as a saint without holiness. Rome, here as everywhere, retains the semblance without the reality, the form without the power. She has Apostles without inspiration, the office without the grace of which the office was but the expression. Thus she feeds herself and her children upon ashes."—R.]

* [BAYNE (from EADIE) on ver. 4: "Here he confuteth the papists, on account of their cursed practice in taking away the key of knowledge—the reading of the Scriptures; in which fact they are like the Philistines, putting out the eyes of Samson, and taking away the smiths, not leaving a weapon in Israel."—R.]

genuine expression of the truth, accomplished by the clarifying reflection of the collected spirit (comp. Petersen, *Idee der Christlichen Kirche*, 2, p. 181 ff.). The propositions: it is true, because it is in the Scriptures, and it is in the Scriptures because it is true, supplement each other.

7. *The Church* is to be conceived of as a communion rising above the limits of time and of the history of humanity on the earth; it reaches into eternity. But it is also to be regarded as a sphere of the operations of God and of the revelation of His glory, which has a significance, not merely terrestrial but cosmical: a place of the revelation of the Lord, which is the high school of angels (ver. 10); we are not indeed the professors at whose feet the angels must sit as scholars, but it is God who leads them onward in the knowledge of His wisdom; we are but the means of instruction. They attend the work of Redemption from the beginning: Matth. i. 20; ii. 13, 19; Luke i. 11, 26 ff.; ii. 9 ff. Matth. iv. 11; Luke xxii. 43; Matth. xxviii. 2 ff. 1 Tim. iii. 16.

8. Creation and Redemption stand in internal connection (ver. 9); the former was not willed by God without the latter, and is arranged and ordered with reference to it.

9. The strength of the consciousness of sin (ver. 8) is here intensified by means of the contrast with the high office; it is not conditioned by special and peculiar sin, but by his especially clear and profound self-knowledge in the light of the gospel of Jesus Christ, which it was his duty to preach. Harless: "Into the inmost depths of the soul each one sees only for himself; what he sees *in* himself, he does not see *on* others; what he sees there says to him, that sin dwells in him (Rom. vii. 17) and that the wrath of God is upon him, and that now when God's grace has saved him, he has nothing which he has not received (1 Cor. iv. 7); the hearts of others are searched not by him, but by God." It cannot be affirmed, then, to be a constantly recurring phenomenon, that the most powerful witnesses to Christian truth have been led there through previous and great errors and wanderings; it is however true that such must have obtained a deeper knowledge and experience of corruption in their own hearts, passing through hard and humiliating struggles. Conversion in their case is no greater act of God's grace than in that of others; they feel it as such, however, more vividly and overwhelmingly: Has the Lord helped me, then I know not whom He is unable and unwilling to help!

10. The *ground-tone* of the Christian is "boldness" (ver. 12), which has a two-fold reference: 1) backwards to the accusing guilt and forwards to the exalted goal; 2) downwards to the threatening world and upwards to the Ever-Present One. In the first aspect this "boldness" is fearless and undoubting confidence, that sin is forgiven, its power broken, and its eradication assured, according to the promise: in the other it is the joyful assurance of the favor and nearness of God, which cannot be disturbed by circumstances the most adverse.—Hence with this "boldness" is joined "the access in confidence" to the throne of the Most High, in the prayer, certain of a hearing, to be preserved in grace and mercy, and to obtain help against the evil without us and the sin within us. [Or taking the other view of the passage, such "boldness and access" possessed "in confidence" so exalts, that he who suffers comforts those who sympathize; the sympathy of Christ not only rises above human sympathy in consoling power, but makes the sufferer able to remove in turn the reflected sorrow in the hearts of sympathizing friends.—R.]

11. Concerning *faith* it is only stated here, that it is the medium of the blessed condition of the child of God (ver. 12: "through our faith in Him"); it alone gives a courageous spirit, constancy and joyous confidence; without it "we have" none of these.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

That is an elevating sight—a man who has overcome sorrow and compelled it to grant him joy, strength, comfort, as a star in the night joyously twinkles for the traveller. It is sad enough, when a man, an heir of eternal life, a child of a Heavenly Father, permits himself to be overcome by sorrow and cast forth like a faded leaf from the tree, to be trodden under foot, instead of affording shade.—The cause of sorrow was to Paul a cause of joy: on account of the Gentiles, to whom he preached the gospel, he was persecuted, and this persecution turned out for their advantage.—Paul was like a sword in the contest against error and falsehood and godlessness; life was the workshop, God the Lord was the master, who formed it, but suffering was the anvil and hammer, by means of which it became solid and sharp; and that was good for the church.—That sufferer is right and sets God right before others, who is like a farmer, that knows the bright sky is ever behind the cloud of sorrow, and finds in streaming rain a blessing from above, and thus praises and thankfully accepts what city folks call "bad weather."—See to it that you know what gifts are given to you and for what. For in this is the task which you have to do; are you uncertain whether others have rightly profited by you, still be certain of this, that you have done your duty.—Joy in the ministerial office must be greater than the sorrow over the injuries which accompany it. Your calling among men is a gift of God to you and you should be a blessing of God to others.—God does not bestow His gifts of grace perfect and complete out of heaven, as one hangs up a picture in his room; but He produces them in our lives, like a harvest, for while the field is prepared, the seed sown and harrowed in, and sunshine and rain, day and night are ordained.

The Scriptures lay claim to be heard on one matter alone. God's everlasting mercy in Jesus Christ: Is that of importance to you, then the Bible is also: only there is this made clear to you.—About what is spiritual, Divine, eternal, you find no such information anywhere else, whether among the Greeks or the Germans or the English, as in the prophets and Apostles of Jesus Christ; they are greater than all the world's philosophers and poets.—It is wonderful how the mystery of Christ, the theme of the symphony of the Holy Scriptures gradually passes

from the faint twilight through the gray morning of the prophets to the bright day in the birth and death of Jesus Christ, and the church, like a Memnon-statue, give a clear note in the beams of the rising sun.—"In a few lines!" often enough a mere phrase. Not so here: the rich contents, the deep insight, the pleasure in the communication, the love to the Church—all these conspire to make what is written brief, all too brief. Here the preacher may learn: *much matter, few words!*—Hear in the congregation, read in the closet! Walk in the Spirit and search in the Scriptures! Shun not solitude, but seek God there! These are three exhortations and three rules for the growth of the inner man.—If you do not consider yourself worse than others, you have not yet known yourself or God.—You should not lose joy or power in your calling, when you recognize in humility your own insignificance, the office is ever greater than its incumbent and rather holds him than he it.—He who with the microscope of God's word, honestly searches and knows his own heart and life, will have in the same word, a telescope to help his gaze toward the furthest heaven, the world of angels and the life eternal, in blissful gratitude.

STARKE:—Papal Rome and what belongs thereto is as cruel as heathen Rome was, since it arrests and imprisons so many real Christians.—Let no one run into the important office of the preacher, unless God has sent him there.—Reason knows nothing of the mystery of Christ; it is a revelation from God.—God did not at once make known the secrets of His will in all their extent and present distinctness, but it pleased the Divine Wisdom to proceed therein gradually.—Each book of the Bible is like a jewel in a golden crown; Paul's Epistles, however, have this excellence, that they lead more richly, powerfully and emphatically to Christ. Hence we must use them like daily bread for the nourishment of our souls. Happy are they who in such a perusal can say: the longer, the dearer!—The calling of the Gentiles remains full of mysteries, for thus God has shown His grace, power and truth.—Why should he who is endowed with office and gifts in Christ's Church exalt himself? He is what he is, and has what he has, not of merit, but all of grace.—The gospel has to do with the unsearchable riches of Christ: away with all else from the pulpit, such as mere human science, pleasant stories, fables, *etc.*—Learn also, O my soul, with the angels the manifold wisdom of God; learn it in the church, and watch how wonderfully God has gathered, called, upheld and protected it; learn it in thyself, and notice how wondrously He has led thee through this world.—Those teachers should be ashamed who attempt to force from the flock with knocks and scoldings, what would be so much better gained by more winning ways, by requests and entreaties.—When faithful shepherds have weak and timid sheep they must strengthen them with the consolations of the word of God and thus instil courage.—The tribulations of its teachers are no disgrace to the Church, but honor and glorious strengthening. For the power of the Spirit and of the truth manifests itself most gloriously, when on this account one is willing to suffer also.

RIEGER:—The chain and the soldier, with which and to whom Paul was bound made him the prisoner of the Emperor, but the willingness of spirit with which these bonds were borne was from Jesus Christ; hence he was "the prisoner of Christ Jesus," who also was near him and had an oversight of all that occurred to him. To know and make known God in His unsearchable love is more than to investigate all the works of His hands.—God will not give up His right as Creator, His purpose, which he had in the foundation of the world, with respect to the Kingdom of His Son, but through Redemption will save the Creation, and restore it to its original goodness.—How greatly is the manifold wisdom of God made known through the Church, in the gathering of it from all tribes and tongues, in the adorning of it with so many and varied gifts, in overruling all events for its good, in enduring so many tares, in the unfailing fulfilment of all the declarations of God.

HEUBNER:—Every one has a criterion of his Christian knowledge, in his proper perception of the purpose of God in Christ and the indispensableness of Christ. In our day this is often willingly changed. Many would make of Christianity, something local, temporal, and thus degrade it.—Christ is inexhaustible for mind and heart; we find all in Him. If we would speak of Him, the theme is never exhausted. Let us never make of this rich Christ a poor one!—What Christ has instituted must truly be something transcendent, and not so common that every intellect can discover it; else the angels would not be able to look into it and be satisfied therewith.

PASSAVANT:—Paul will not speak or teach from his own wisdom or his own inspirations; he will not give or recommend any thing, that is from his own thought or mind or will; at this he trembles, against this his whole conduct and life in the service of his Lord speaks. Nor will he speak a single word of any wise or learned one of this world, any birth or abortion of their little brain and great conceit; as little will he borrow from their idle word.—Divinely great was the light, which appeared, on so many pages of the Psalms and Prophets, respecting the calling of the Gentiles; yet even to the Old Testament seers themselves this, like many other things in the future universal economy of salvation, remained largely in the dark; much both in general and in particular was still concealed. Still less than they, did the people to whom they prophesied, perceive this mystery. Besides this, up to the times of Christ and afterwards, the view of most of them was disturbed by their inborn enmity and profound contempt for the Gentiles.—Among these "holy Apostles and prophets" none seem to have viewed the mystery of Christ with so clear, profound and quick a glance as did the Apostle Paul.—The great Apostle knows nothing save grace, will know nothing save grace.—The richer my life, my experience, my knowledge of grace, the richer the gifts, the joys, the richer my eternity, the nearer to the eternal building of God, so much the less can I understand it all, so much more deep and unfathomable are these depths.—"The highest of sciences is Christianity!" says a friend of God; "little

as Christians devote their attention and study to it! the highest, most enlightened of the angels have made it their study, and learn from it to perceive God in a manner worthy of Him; and those, for whom such a master-piece is wrought, do not know it nor deem it worth their knowledge." Others, on the contrary, search therein in an ungodly spirit alone, their wit will guess everything, their intellect explain all, even arrange all; will blame and criticise, will approve and deny, will break up and break off,—and the powers on high in eternal light wait patiently, until light and knowledge comes to them respecting these things.

STIER:—The bonds themselves preach to the Gentiles; they reveal even to the Apostle himself something new.—The *reading for one's self* is pre-supposed and recommended in the case of each individual.—Missions are the continued, God-given, gracious and spiritual life of the church, her impulse of growth. They re-act as powerfully, widely and thoroughly as the preaching of the gospel on the church of the baptized, since from them we first learned the idea of the *Inner Mission*, or as the English say still more beautifully: *Home Missions.*

ZIEL (on Eph. iii. 8–21):—The Apostle Paul was a rich man in his prison: I. Rich in the unsearchable riches of Christ, to the proclamation of which the grace of God had called him (vers. 8–12); 2. Rich in his fervent love to the brethren, which revealed itself in his supplication for them (vers. 13–19); 3. Rich in his unswerving confidence in God, who can do exceeding abundantly above all we can ask or think, and with whose praise he is full (vers. 20, 21).

[EADIE:—Ver. 8. The riches of Christ are the true wealth of men and nations. And those riches are unsearchable. Even the value of the portion already possessed cannot be told by any symbols of numeration, for such riches can have no adequate exponent or representative. The latest periods of time shall find those riches unimpaired, and eternity shall behold the same wealth neither worn by use nor dimmed by age, nor yet diminished by the myriads of its happy participants.—Ver. 9. If we gaze upon a landscape as the rising sun strikes successive points and brings them into view in every variety of tint and shade, both subjective and objective illumination is enjoyed. No wonder that in so many languages light is the emblem of knowledge.—At the fittest time, not prematurely, but with leisurely exactness, were created both the human materials on which redemption was to work that peculiar and varied mechanism by which its designs were to be accomplished.—Ver. 10. In the proclamation of the gospel to the Gentiles, with its strange preparations, various agencies and stupendous effects—involving the origination and extinction of Judaism, the incarnation and the atonement, the manger and the cross, the spread of the Greek language and the triumph of the Roman arms—"these principalities and powers in heavenly places" beheld with rapture other and brighter phases of a wisdom which had often dazzled them by its brilliant and profuse versatility, and surprised and entranced them by the infinite fulness of the love which prompts it, and of the power which itself directs and controls.—Ver. 11. In all this procedure, which reveals to princedoms and powers God's manifold wisdom, the Divine eternal plan is consistently and systematically developed in Christ.—R.]

[HODGE:—"Through faith of him." How may I come to God with the assurance of acceptance? The answer given by the Apostle, and confirmed by the experience of the saints of all ages, is, 'By faith in Jesus Christ.' It is because men rely on some other means of access, either bringing some worthless bribe in their hands, or trusting to some other mediator, priestly or saintly, that so many fail who seek to enter God's presence.—R.]

[SCHENKEL:—It is a grace to be able to suffer for the sake of the kingdom of God and the advantage of our brethren: for thus to suffer is a blessing 1) for one's own heart, 2) for the church. —The glory of the Apostolic office: 1. As to its ground, resting on revelation; 2. As to its end, to effect a knowledge of the mystery of God.—The preaching of the gospel: 1) As to its purport, it is about the unsearchable riches of Christ; 2) As to its end, the enlightening of a darkened world.—The Christian Church, the bond which links heaven with earth.—R.]

---

2. *The Apostle's petition with an exhortation for the church.*

(CHAP. III. 14–19.)

14 For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ [*omit*
15 of our Lord Jesus Christ],[1] Of [From] whom the whole [every] family in heaven
16 and [on] earth is named, That he would grant[2] you, according to the riches[3] of his
glory, to be strengthened with might by [through] his Spirit in the inner man;
17 That Christ may dwell in your hearts by [through] faith; that ye, being rooted
18 and grounded in love,[4] May be [fully] able to comprehend with all saints what *is*
19 the breadth, and length, and depth, and height;[5] And to know the love of Christ,
which passeth knowledge [or the knowledge-surpassing-love of Christ], that ye
might be filled with [may be filled up to] all the fulness of God.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 14.—[The phrase: τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which follows πατήρ in i. 3; Col. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 3; Rom. xv. 6, should be rejected here. The *weight* of diplomatic authority is against it (omitted in ℵ.[1] A. B. C. 17, 67; found in ℵ.[3] D. F. K. L. and all other cursives). A number of fathers reject it (Jerome expressly speaks of the omission), while the best versions retain it. It is scarcely credible, as De Wette urges, that it was omitted because coming between πατέρα and πατριά, since it really disturbs the rhythmical connection; while on the other hand no addition would be more likely than this from the common formula. If internal grounds have any weight, it must be rejected. So Lachmann, Tischendorf, Rückert, Harless, Meyer, Olshausen, Alford, Ellicott; Eadie inclines to this view. Reiche and De Wette retain it, as does Hodge, who says: "the majority of recent editions and commentators retain them," a statement surprisingly unwarranted. —R.]

[2] Ver. 16.—[The *Rec.* reads δῴη with D. K. L., and most fathers, but δῷ (ℵ. A. B. C. F.) is to be preferred. Comp. i. 17.—R.]

[3] Ver. 16.—[Here also as in i. 7; ii. 7; iii. 8, the *Rec.* gives the masculine form (D.[3] K. L., cursives), but ℵ. A. B. C. D.[1] F. support the neuter.—R.]

[4] Ver. 17.—[Another view of the construction requires the following translation: "That Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith, ye having been rooted and grounded in love, in order that," *etc.* See *Exegetical Notes.*—R.]

[5] Ver. 18.—[The order of the *Rec.* (βάθος καὶ ὕψος) is sustained by ℵ. A. K. L., most cursives; adopted by Tischendorf, Ellicott, Meyer and Braune, as *lectio difficilior.* B. C. D. E. F. G., most versions, give the reverse order, which as more natural and prevalent (Rom. viii. 39) is open to suspicion. It is accepted by Lachmann, Alford and others.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 14. *The connection.* **For this cause,** τούτου χάριν.—Thus Paul connects with ver. 1, where the construction is interrupted. Still with ὑπερ ὑμῶν (ver. 13) he has already resumed what was expressed in ver. 1, and with "which are your glory," referred to the previous current of thought (ii. 22: "ye are builded together"). Comp. iii. 1. [EADIE: "The prayer must be regarded as immediately following that section, and its architectural terms and allusions will thus be more clearly understood." MEYER however explains: on this account that you faint not, *etc.*—R.]

The prayer, vers. 14, 15.

I bow my knees, κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου.—So Phil. ii. 10. It describes τὴν κατανενυγμένην δέησιν (CHRYSOSTOM). BENGEL: "*Si præsens adfuisset Paulus, genua flexisset, exardescente pectore.* Acts xx. 36. Here the reference is to *genua mentis* (JEROME); the idea of "praying" is so prominent, that the accusative sometimes follows the verb γονυπετεῖν (Matth. xvii. 14; Mark x. 17).

Unto the Father, πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.—The phrase is found thus without any qualification in ii. 18; v. 20; Col. i. 12. [On πρός, denoting the direction, see WINER, p. 378. The metaphorical sense of the phrase justifies the preposition; were the idea merely that of bending the knee, a dative would probably follow.—On the phrase: **of our Lord Jesus Christ,** see *Textual Note* [1].—R.]

From whom every family in heaven and on earth is named.*—Ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ—ὀνομάζεται is a paronomasia to πατέρα, which cannot be reproduced, except as Luther (1545) has so beautifully and correctly expressed it: *Der der rechte Vater ist über Alles, was da kinder heisst;* all editions from 1522–1541 read: *was Vater heisst.* Evidently "from whom," ἐξ οὗ, refers to "Father," from Him (ἐξ) originates the name borne (ὀνομάζεται) by him who stands at the head of a group, πατριά, which is thus termed from πατήρ. The etymology must be well considered here. While φυλαί (מַטּוֹת) designates the tribes descending from the sons of Jacob, πατριαί (מִשְׁפָּחוֹת) denotes the families in the several tribes, descending from the sons of Jacob's sons; οἶκοι (בֵּית־הָאָבוֹת) is yet more special in its meaning. Hence the reference here is to larger groups. The word designates a lineage, family, springing from one father and bearing his name. [EADIE: "Every circle of holy and intelligent creatures having the name of πατριά takes that name from God as Πατήρ." So ALFORD, ELLICOTT.—R.] Accordingly something concrete and living is treated of, so that it is not=πατρότης, Fatherhood (THEODORET, JOHN *of Damascus*, ANSELM, LUTHER, 1522–41; MEYER: He is the original Father, the Father of all fathers; THOLUCK, *Sermon on the Mount*, p. 394; NITZSCH, *Prakt. Theol.* I. p. 269).

Πᾶσα without the article (WINER, p. 110) necessarily refers to the multiplicity of the families: *every* family. BENGEL is excellent: *omnis, angelorum, hominum ceterorum, ex ipso, ut patre, pendens;* as David's family from David (Luke ii. 4) and from Abraham, so the blessing comes, like that of a father upon all the families of the earth (Acts iii. 25). The phrase: "in heaven and on earth," ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, joined closely to πατριά without the article, points to the world of angels and of men, referring to the groups dependent on heads and chiefs. We must then understand here classes of angels (comp. on i. 21), since the angels also are called sons, children of God (Job xxxviii. 7; Luke xx. 36) and call God their Father, not merely their Creator, and races of people as national families, although "children of disobedience" (ii. 2; v. 6) are not wanting. For "all angels, all Christians, aye, all children of men are God's children, for He has created them all" (LUTHER) in Christ, the Son of filiation. The word πατριά, which by the addition of πᾶσα and ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, has received an extension of meaning reaching far beyond bodily descent, must be understood not merely in a natural, but also in an *ethical* sense, as indeed the idea: "Father" is thus used. Since "fatherhood" has not a concrete meaning, it cannot be translated by this word, but STIER thus attempts to preserve the concrete force, *der rechte Vater uber Alles, was nach Vätern heisst.*

It is incorrect and ungrammatical to understand by it the *whole* world family (MEYER, OLS-

* [ELLICOTT renders: "From whom every race in heaven and on earth is thus named," while the German text of Braune runs thus in a literal translation: "whose name every family in heaven and on earth bears."—R.]

HAUSEN and others), or only two groups, angels and men (CALVIN), or the saints in heaven and the elect on the earth (CALOV.),* since in that case the article would be found before ἐν οὐρανοῖς and before ἐπὶ γῆς, as in the first case it should stand after πᾶσα. It is incorrect to ignore altogether the idea of groups, families, which Luther's version throws into the background, and to make of God an "All-father" (MEYER). LUTHER has given occasion to this mistake, but corrected it through his translation; for he says there that God is Father over all, that is called children, of course maintained, cared for, as we are, in Christ. It respects more the *right* Father than the *right* children (HARLESS). Finally all polemical reference, such as against the particularism of the Jews (CALVIN), angel-worship (MICHAEL), must be rejected. The passage is *ironical* rather. Comp. *Doctr. Note* 2.

Ver. 16. *The purport of the supplication.* Vers. 16, 17.—**That he would grant you.**—Ἵνα δῷ ὑμῖν marks the *purpose* and consequently the *purport* of the supplication, indicating at the same time the confidence of him who prays, that He who is implored will fulfil his request. Comp. i. 17. [The subject and the purpose thus blended as so often when ἵνα follows a verb signifying (even metaphorically) to pray.—R.]

According to the riches of his glory.—Κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ defines the δῷ more closely, as a rich and glorious giving. He should *give*, not merely announce, according to, in the proportion of His riches in glory. See i. 7, 17; Col. i. 11. "Glory" here embraces the whole glorious perfection of God (MEYER); there is no ground for limiting it to power (GROTIUS) or grace (CALVIN).

To be strengthened with might.—Δυνάμει, "with might," placed first for emphasis, cannot anticipate either the phrase "by his spirit," or "in the inner man," nor can it be an instrumental dative (MEYER), nor does it refer to the will or moral being over against knowledge (HARLESS), which also belongs to the inner man and is given prominence in vers. 18, 19. It qualifies the verb "strengthened," κραταιωθῆναι, which is antithetical to the term ἐγκακεῖν, "faint" (ver. 13) thus not merely excluding discouragement and weakness, but marking also the external efficiency, the influence on the world, the overcoming as well as the standing fast, like ἀνδρίζεσθε before κραταιοῦσθε (1 Cor. xvi. 13). See vi. 10; Col. i. 11; 1 Pet. v. 10. Hence the passage does not refer to mere passivity, so that δυνάμει is merely a strengthening of the verb (RUECKERT). LUTHER is incorrect: "That he may give you strength—to become strong." [The instrumental sense is adopted by ELLICOTT, HODGE, ALFORD, EADIE and many others. Braune's view virtually resolves the dative into an adverb. ELLICOTT: It defines "the element or influence of which the spirit is the '*causa medians*.'" The contrast with ἐγκακεῖν, though plausible, must not be pressed. EADIE, who finds a reference to the figure of the temple in ver. 18, sees an architectural allusion here. —R.]

Through his Spirit [διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ].—The means of imparting such strength is indicated thus (αὐτοῦ=θεοῦ, who is implored); God's Holy Spirit makes us strong within, and thus prepares not only the actual fellowship in the kingdom of God, but also the powerful demonstration of the same; hence BENGEL well says: *δυνάμει bene congruit cum mentione spiritus.*

In the inner man.—[Εἰς here is not=ἐν, nor=in regard of (MEYER, WINER, DE WETTE, HODGE: as to), but "to and into," marking "the direction and destination of the prayed for gift of infused strength" (ELLICOTT).—R.] Ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος (so also Rom. vii. 22) is the antithesis of ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος (2 Cor. iv. 16), which "perishes," while "the inward man is renewed day by day." It is not something physical, but moral, hence too, not=νοῦς, which can have a "vanity" (iv. 17), of which "corrupt" can be predicated (1 Tim. vi. 5), which is impossible in the case of the inner man. It is rather="the hidden man of the heart" (1 Pet. iii. 4) and refers to the concealed, displaced and obscured image of God within us. Accordingly the Apostle says εἰς τὸν ἔσω, to become strong so far as to reach within to this; the preposition thus marking the aim towards which the becoming strong should be constantly and renewedly directed. See WINER, p. 389. Accordingly "the inner man" cannot be used interchangeably with "the new man" (iv. 24); the latter is the new creature, in which the former lives again, rises anew out of the death of sin which has come upon it: "the inner man" does not stand in antithesis to the "body," but includes so much of it as God in the creation has prepared and designed for the life in glory, in the new creation for the resurrection of the body. See *Doctr. Note* 3. [Comp. LANGE, *Romans* vii. 7–25, especially my Excursus, pp. 232–236.*—R.]

* [So BODIUS and HODGE, both insisting upon the exclusive reference to the redeemed. The argument of the latter rests altogether on the incorrect reading he accepts. Admitting that the omission of the article favors the rendering: "every family," he adds that it may still be omitted where the sense is "the whole family," provided the context is so clear as to prevent mistake. But it is not so clear, else the great body of commentators would not have mistaken it; hence the condition is not met. Besides the context does not teach, except critical judgments are to give way to exegetical preferences, "that those who are here contemplated as children, are those who are by Jesus Christ brought into this relation to God." "Consequently" it ought not to be affirmed that "the word πατριά cannot include any but the subjects of redemption."—Undoubtedly there is an underlying thought of redemption; "it is not in virtue of God's creative power that the Apostle here prays to Him, but in virtue of His adoptive love in Christ" (ALFORD). The thought of an "All-Father" is remote enough, but any unnecessary limitation of πᾶσα πατριά is at the same time a limitation of the wider results of Redemptive Love so frequently hinted at by Paul and not very remote here (ver. 10). ALFORD: "The Apostle seems, regarding God as the Father of us His adopted children, to go forth into the fact, that He, in this His relation to us, is in reality the great original and proto-type of the paternal relation, wherever found." And in an ethical sense this relation may be readily conceived of as existing in heaven among other than those redeemed from earth.—R.]

* [Dr. HODGE, very sweepingly, intimates that all those interpretations which distinguish this "inner man" from the renewed man, belong to "the theory of Semi-Pelagianism, embodied and developed in the theology of the Church of Rome." But this is based on a mere assumption, viz., that this view of "the inner man" as the seat of spiritual influences implies the actual sinlessness and unfallen status of "that inner man," an implication distinctly denied by many of the supporters of this theory, among whom are expositors,

Ver. 17. **That Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith.**—This verse forms an explanatory, further developing, parallel to the infinitive clause of ver. 16. We have here a second petition, in continuation of the first, hence Luther is not altogether incorrect in inserting an epexegetical "and." [See below.] Κατοικῆσαι denotes a permanent indwelling of one taking entire possession, as Col. i. 19; ii. 9; Matth. xii. 45; Luke xi. 26; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Jas. iv. 5. The expression *οἰκεῖν*, Rom. vii. 20 (ver. 17: *ἐνοικοῦσα*), viii. 9; 1 Cor. iii. 16, is weaker. Here it stands first for emphasis and refers to *κατοικητήριον*, ii. 21, 22. Comp. John xiv. 21-23. BENGEL is excellent: *in perpetuum.* It corresponds to "strengthened with might," which precedes it; as the former is marked as an effect from without, from above, by "*into* the inner man," so the latter is distinguished by "*in* your hearts," as an internal condition.

Διὰ τῆς πίστεως [almost=through *your* faith] denotes in any case a power of the Spirit which has been appropriated by the Christian; accordingly the previous petition was *διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος*, "through the Spirit," to whom the initiative belongs, the Spirit of Christ, preparing for Him (BENGEL: *ubi spiritus Dei, ibi etiam Christus*), while *πίστις*, "faith," is wrought by the Spirit in the human spirit, is the power of man, awakened, directed, strengthened by the Holy Spirit, to appropriate Christ, to become Christ's. Hence it is neither *idem per idem* (MATTHIES), nor something entirely different (RUECKERT), nor yet a consequence from what precedes, independent of *δῷ*, but dependent on *κραταιωθῆναι* (BLEEK).

[The connection has been much discussed. MEYER (following CALVIN: *declarat, quale sit interioris hominis robur*) takes the clause as Braune does: parallel to the last clause of ver. 16, with an explanatory force. DE WETTE explains the infinitive as one of design, an opinion to which EADIE formerly inclined. Notwithstanding Braune's objection, the simplest explanation is that of BLEEK, adopted previously however by ALFORD and ELLICOTT among others. This accepts the clause as one expressive of the *result* ("so that") of the inward strengthening. The emphasis resting on the infinitive seems to demand this (ALFORD). This is a somewhat lax construction, but clearly admissible (WINER, p. 298).—The view which connects "the inner man" with this verse (*Syriac*, AMBROSIASTER, PELAGIUS): "In order that Christ may inhabit the inner man by the faith which is in your hearts," is altogether untenable. On *καρδία*, comp. i. 18; DELITZSCH, *Bib. Psychologie*, II. p. 203 f.: "the seat and centre of the moral life viewed on the side of the affections." CALVIN: "*Partem etiam designat ubi legitima est Christus sedes; nempe cor: ut sciamus, non satis esse, si in lingua versatur, aut in cerebro volitet.*—R."]

The end of the supplication; vers. 18, 19 *a.*

Ver. 18. **That ye.**—Ἵνα, "that," is placed after the closer definition of the subject, as *ἕως*, 2 Thess. ii. 7, and as *ἵνα* is put after the object in 2 Cor. ii. 4; Gal. ii. 10; Acts xix. 4. Similarly 1 Cor. xi. 14, 15; xiv. 7 (*ἐάν*), 16 (*πῶς*). [So Rom. xi. 31, where however Dr. Lange denies the trajection. This view of the construction is accepted by BEZA, CAMERARIUS, GROTIUS, CALIXTUS, SEMLER, STORR, ROSENMUELLER, FLATT, MEIER, MEYER, WINER (eds. 6, 7), BUTTMANN, SCHENKEL, HODGE. It is however adopted by none of the ancient versions except the Gothic, is rejected by ORIGEN expressly. The other view joins this clause to what precedes, as a consequence of the indwelling of Christ, accepting an irregular nominative. So in the main: CHRYSOSTOM, ERASMUS, LUTHER, ESTIUS, MORUS, KOPPE, RUECKERT, MATTHIES, HARLESS, OLSHAUSEN, B-CRUSIUS, DE WETTE, BLEEK, EADIE, ELLICOTT, ALFORD. Our preference is for the former construction. See below.—R.]*

who cannot be classed among the advocates of Semi-Pelagianism. I append the statement of ELLICOTT, which agrees with my own view, referred to above: "The expression ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος (Rom. vii. 22) is nearly identical with, but somewhat more inclusive than ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος (I Pet. iii. 4), and stands in antithesis to ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος (2 Cor. iv. 16); the former being practically equivalent to the νοῦς or higher nature of man (Rom. vii. 23), the latter to the σάρξ or μέλη: see BECK, *Seelenlehre*, III. 21, 3, p. 68. It is within this ἔσω ἄνθρωπος that the powers of regeneration are exercised (HARLESS, *Christl. Ethik*, § 22 *a*), and it is from their operation in this province that the whole man ('*secunda interna spectatus*,' Bengel) becomes a νέος ἄνθρωπος (as opposed to a former state), or a καινὸς ἄνθρωπος (as opposed to a former corrupt state), and is either ὁ κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθεὶς (chap. iv. 24), or ὁ ἀνακαινούμενος εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν (Col. iii. 10), according to the point of view under which regeneration is regarded. The distinction between this and the partially synonymous terms πνεῦμα and νοῦς may perhaps be thus roughly stated: πνεῦμα is simply the highest of the three parts of which man is composed; νοῦς the πνεῦμα regarded more in its *moral* and intellectual aspects, '*quatenus intelligit, cogitat, et vult;*' ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος the πνεῦμα or rather the whole immaterial portion, considered in its *theological aspects*, and as the seat of the inworking powers of grace." To which may be added that owing to the fact that πνεῦμα has also a second meaning (the human spirit as inwrought upon by the Divine Spirit), Paul does not use it in Rom. vii. 7-25, but rather νοῦς and ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος. This view of the phrase is adopted by EADIE and ALFORD, and may be regarded as the prevalent one in Germany, perhaps now among English commentators.—R.]

* [EADIE thus states his view: The change of syntax indicates a change of connection, and the use of the irregular nominative makes the transition easy to the form adopted with ἵνα. The clause thus changed becomes a species of independent proposition, giving a marked prominence to the sense, and connected at once with the preceding context as its result, and with the following context as its starting idea. So ELLICOTT, who in his translation puts a dash before and after the clause. The course of thought then is: "Christ dwelling in their hearts—they are supposed, as the effect of this inhabitation, to have been now rooted and grounded in love; and as the design of this confirmation in love—they are then and there qualified to comprehend," *etc.* This construction is certainly admissible, although HARLESS is fanciful in accounting for it by the reference to both the dative and genitive which precede. MEYER presents the forcible objection that the present participles would occur were this the connection. When to this it is replied, "that the clause does express the state which must ensue upon the indwelling of Christ before what is expressed in the next clause can in any way be realized, and that therefore the perf. part. is correctly used" (ELLICOTT), I find in this but a confession of that subordinate relation of the clause to the next one, which is implied in the other view. If the ideas are so nearly similar, a trajection seems a better explanation, than to complicate the relation of the clauses further (we have already a leading clause in ver. 14, a clause of purport in ver. 16, containing a finite verb followed by an infinitive, on which infinitive a clause of result depends, ver. 17. The view under discussion would make an irregular sub-subordinate clause of result to be followed (ver. 18) by a clause of design, which the other view would append directly to the purport of the prayer). On the other hand this metathesis is open to objection. Such a trajection implies an emphasis on the words thrown in advance, and it is asserted that there is no necessity for such emphasis here, but this is no real objection, since the words *can* be emphatic (notwithstanding ALFORD's denial). Again, it is said that the premised words in all such cases form the objective factor of the sentence and are not connected with

Being rooted and grounded in love.—The perfect participles, ἐῤῥιζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι, denote a state, in which they already are and continue to be, which is the pre-supposition, in order that they may be able to know. This state is effected by what has been prayed for in vers. 15, 16; hence according to the sense and the context it is impossible to connect these participles with what precedes (Chrysostom, Luther: "and to become rooted and grounded through love," Rueckert, Harless, Bleek and others), even if it were grammatically admissible to join a nominative to ὑμῶν, as in iv. 23: ὑμᾶς—ἀνεχόμενοι—σπουδάζοντες. Col. ii. 2; iii. 16. See Winer, p. 532. This position gives especial weight to the participles, which introduce two figures borrowed from a tree and a building. They mark that a profoundly penetrating life (ἐῤῥιζωμένοι) and a well-grounded, permanent character (τεθεμελιωμένοι) are necessary. [The first may be regarded as used "without any other allusion to its primitive meaning than that of *fixedness, firmness* at the *base* or *foundation*" (Ellicott).—R.] Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 9; Col. ii. 7.

The double figure strengthens the notion of the relation to love; this latter (ἐν ἀγάπῃ) is made prominent by being placed first. "In" marks "love" as the soil, *in* which they are rooted, and as the foundation, *on* which they are grounded. This implies moreover that it is not their own love which is referred to, but one which corresponds with the soil afforded to the tree, the foundation given to the house; and this would undoubtedly be, in accordance with the context, the love of Christ (Bengel), were not all closer definition wanting, even the article. Accordingly this substantive rendered general by the absence of the article corresponds with the verbal idea: in loving, *i. e.* in that love, which is first God's in Christ and then that of men who become Christians, who are rooted in Him and grounded on Him through faith. [The reference to the Christian grace of love (Eadie, Alford, Ellicott) is preferable, since it does not lay too much stress on the absence of the article, as is done by both Meyer (*in amando*) and Harless (*subjective*, because anarthrous), and does not confound two things (God's love to us and our love in response), either of which might be represented as soil and foundation, scarcely both.—R.] But it is not necessary to supply "in Christ" (Harless) in thought, as if "in love" could be instrumental and the preposition could be repeated with two different references and used in joining two distinct definitions. Nor should it be limited to "love of the brethren" (Calvin, Schenkel, Bleek and others), as is still further evident from what follows.

May be fully able to comprehend [ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε καταλαβέσθαι].—Καταλαβέσθαι here means more than a mere intellectual apprehension, a perception, as in Acts iv. 13; xxv. 25; x. 34, but pre-eminently an inward experience: it corresponds with γνῶναι, which is conjoined to it with τε, but differs from it however, the first word denoting the inward experience, the latter the spiritual perception. [The tense of this verb perhaps implies the singleness of the act, and the voice the exercise of the mental power, a *dynamic* middle (Krueger), indicating the earnestness or spiritual energy with which the action is performed (Ellicott).—R.] The verb ἐξισχύσητε, placed in emphatic position, adds the idea of exertion, an energetic pressing through; Bengel: *evaleatis.*

Something important is treated of, which cannot be comprehended in solitude, for one's self alone, but only in fellowship: **with all saints,** σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἁγίοις.—Like all science, the science of God's love, the study of God, is a joint labor.

What is the breadth and length and depth and height, τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ βάθος καὶ ὕψος.—The lively, roused spirit of the Apostle here borrows the figure of a body, a mathematical magnitude [*sacra illa Pauli mathematica*], as in Job xi. 8, 9, it is applied to God's wisdom and perfection; it is instead of and = τί τὸ μέγεθος, what is the greatness. Since the article occurs but once, the unity of the object referred to is strongly indicated. Very naturally the "breadth" comes first, to this the "length" corresponds; then the "depth" is the nearest dimension, and the "height" closes the series: what is the object then whose dimensions Paul notices here? It is not directly designated, and hence must be taken from the context. The added clause connected with this by τε points at once to "the love of Christ." The dimensions set forth here then become clear: "breadth" refers to the nations lying beside each other on the earth, over all of whom the love of Christ will extend itself; "length," to the successive ages during which it will reach; "depth," to the misery and corruption of sin, into which it will descend; "height" to the glory at God's throne and near His heart to which it would elevate all.

To return to ver. 9 and accept "the mystery" as the object (Chrysostom, Calovius, Rueckert, Harless and others) is as unfounded as to find a reference to "the fulness of God" (ver. 19), and with Rev. xi. 1; xxi. 15, 16, to understand the Church of Christ, the temple of God (Bengel, Stier, [Eadie], and others), or merely to supply "of God" or "of Christ" (Matthies, and others); Holzhausen alone suggests "our love!" Arbitrary as many of the explanations of the four dimensions undoubtedly are, the opinion of Meyer, that *every* special interpretation is unpsychological, only opening the door to subjective speculations, is equally unjustifiable. *Abusus non tollit usum.* The thought of the Apostle is clear: Loved and loving thou knowest the love of Christ. Certainly it is not: In the love to the brethren thou wilt know God's love. Comp. 1 John iv. 10, 16; John xv. 9-11.

[This simple view of the object whose dimensions are here predicated is held in the main by Calvin, Calixtus, Morus, Storr, Hodge, Meyer, Ellicott. Eadie strangely enough opposes it because τε follows: see his notes for a good *resumé* of opinions. Ellicott says: "The consequent clause, without being dependent or explanatory, still practically supplies the defining

---

the subject as here (Ellicott). Ellicott's remark is true as regards the other cases where ἵνα is trajected, but in 2 Thess. ii. 7, ἕως is put after the subject, which if not strictly parallel, is certainly analogous.—R.]

genitive: Paul pauses on the word ὕψος, and then, perhaps feeling it the most appropriate characteristic of Christ's love, he appends, without finishing the construction, a parallel thought which hints at the same conception (ὑπερβάλλουσαν), and suggests the required genitive." ALFORD, less correctly, leaves the object indefinite: "of all that God has revealed or done in or for us," a view which results from his insisting on the subordinate character of the clause introduced by τε. This little word really settles the question the other way.—An allusion to the temple of Diana (MACKNIGHT, CHANDLER) is exceedingly improbable, and the reference to the Christian Church finds no support in the context, foregoing or subsequent. AUGUSTINE gives the fanciful explanation: *sacramentum cruces*, which ESTIUS elaborates. Comp. that of SEVERIANUS (in ALFORD), and the various homiletical applications given in *Hom. Notes*.—R.]

Ver. 19. **And to know the knowledge-surpassing love of Christ** [γνῶναί τε τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ].—Γνῶναί τε adds something closely related, giving prominence to the perception of what has become a matter of internal experience. The object is "the love of Christ," obviously Christ's love, not our love to Him. To the former alone is the attribute "knowledge-surpassing" applicable. BENGEL: *Suavissima hæc quasi correctio est; dixerat: cognoscere, statim negat cognitionem idoneam haberi posse.* The participle, which is here placed between the article and substantive, must evidently be taken as an adjective, governing with its comparative meaning the genitive which follows, *superiorem cognitione*. See WINER, p. 324. It is = ὑπέχουσαν πάντα νοῦν, "which passeth all understanding" (Phil. iv. 7). Comp. Phil. iii. 8-10. It is an oxymoron, like 1 Cor. i. 21, 25; 2 Cor. viii. 2; Gal. ii. 19; 1 Tim. v. 6, and refers to an (adequate) apprehension of the love of Christ which surpasses knowledge (*i. e.*, the particular abstract knowledge, which is possible to man of himself). HARLESS: "Love fully solves the mystery of love; only love experiences love and knows love. The γνῶσις of the reflecting understanding finds its limit here; the γνῶσις of love understands the love of Christ, which otherwise far transcended γνῶσις." LUTHER (1522–41): also to know the love of Christ, which yet exceeds all knowledge; in 1545 the incorrect rendering first appeared, which goes too far in the attempt to popularize the Scriptural language: and to know that to love Christ is better than all knowing. This is contrary both to the language and the context. Yet it cannot be said, that the love of Christ is the object of a knowledge, which never attains its full end (RUECKERT). Against this is the previous expression: "that ye may be able," as well as the remainder of the verse. [Nor can we accept the view of HARLESS and OLSHAUSEN: "that ye may know that the love of Christ is knowledge-surpassing," since the participle, which is properly taken as an adjective, is thus twisted into an infinitive, and since the Apostle's prayer is thus unnecessarily shorn of its fulness.—R.]

The final end of the supplication; ver. 19 *b.*

That ye may be filled up.—This phrase connects itself with "that ye may be able . . to know," and designates the highest, last favor which the Apostle implores for the Church. With what are they to be filled?

To all the fulness of God [εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ.]—Εἰς designates that toward and unto which the becoming filled proceeds, and πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα, *meta est* (BENGEL), to which the Church should attain, when it is filled. It is therefore in her, not without her. Hence the Apostle is treating of a fulness in them which God grants, and which is unincumbered, unabridged. They must themselves, through the experience and knowledge of the love of Christ, be prepared, expanded, strengthened and fitted to receive πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα, "all the fulness," which God will impart, has determined and ordained to impart. What God imparts is indeed in Him, from His own character and glory He imparts. LUTHER: "That is according to the Hebrew mode of speech as much as to say, that we are filled in every way, by which *He makes full*—that He alone completely rules and works in us."

It is a bolder expression than 2 Pet. i. 4: "partakers of the Divine nature." Comp. iv. 13; Col. ii. 9, 10. CHRYSOSTOM: πληροῦσθαι πάσης ἀρετῆς, ἧς πλήρης ἐστὶν ὁ θεός. THEODORET: ἵνα τελείως αὐτὸν ἔνοικον δέξησθε. It is not to be limited to the presence of grace (HARLESS), or to *charisms* (MEYER), nor to be pantheistically extended or applied to the universe, filling itself in God, *i. e.*, reaching the highest expression of its perfection, and reflecting itself in the Church, so that in it there is no more defect to be discovered (SCHENKEL). A fulness of God, which complements His Godhead, as though God's Being were first perfected through the Church, is as little the subject treated of as a pantheistic deification of men. See i. 23. The Apostle undoubtedly refers to the persons and personal culture of the individual members of the Church. See *Doctr. Note.* 4.

[MEYER and DE WETTE take πλήρωμα in the sense of πλῆθος, and the genitive as that of origin. But the GREEK FATHERS, and OLSHAUSEN, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, HODGE, among late commentators, prefer to take πλήρωμα in the strict sense of *id quo res impletur*, and the genitive as a possessive, implying: "that ye may be so filled as God is filled," the reference being not to charismatic gifts, but to the spiritual perfections of God. The only objection is, that such a fulness could not be realized here in a state of imperfection, but εἰς shows that a standard is here set up, and none but a perfect one would be thus held before them. The other view is too tame for the climactic position and force of the clause. ALFORD: "All the fulness of the Godhead abides in Christ, Col. ii. 9. Christ then abiding in your hearts, ye, being raised up to the comprehension of God's mercy in Him and of His love, will be filled, even as God is full—each in your degree, but all to your utmost capacity, with Divine wisdom, might and love."—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The fervency of the *worship* (κάμπτω τὰ

γόνατά μου) does not lose itself in the joyous sense of the love of God (πρὸς τὸν πατέρα), but becomes more deep and clear in love to the neighbor, in unselfish *supplication*, which in the scale of prayer rises above the lowest grade, which is a cry of need, a cry for help, above the grade of a pupil, the petition for supply of needed good and protection from threatening evil, and approaches in its best feature the master-prayer of thanksgiving, which is so often forgotten, and of praise, that so often is not understood.

2. *The Father* who is here supplicated is not the All-father of the 18th century or of the rationalists, nor the Father of the heathen. For He is not that weak father, who on account of His goodness consents to withdraw all the demands of His righteousness; nor is He merely the Creator, as if He were, like Jupiter, a father of the trees and animals, of the flowers of earth and the stars of heaven, as well as of angels and men, and as if the idea of "Father" included only that of the Creator, who calls into being. The father is more than the begetter, he is also the provider, the teacher, the guardian in preserving sacred love. Where such paternal care exists, it comes from God, it points to Him, the original Father. Even the most scanty traces of such fatherhood, *i. e.*, of such companies with a father at their hand, point to Him, who has ordained and still sustains such relations. The children may be lost and not permit Him to work within them; still traces of Him, kindnesses from Him are so little wanting, that even among the heathen "an altar with this inscription, To the unknown God," points to them. The Church sings and speaks of a λόγος σπερματικός, and sees a great family in different groups, in different circumstances, conditions and attitudes, but at the head, over all and for all the One Father in Christ.

3. *The inner man* (ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος) is the remnant of the man created in the image of God, which is found in all men, even though extremely disfigured or shrivelled up into insignificance. On this account is Redemption possible, man is capable as well as in need of redemption. Hence the inner man is to be thus distinguished from the new man (ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος): the former is the remnant of the original man as created by God in His own image, the latter is the beginning of the regenerated man, new born in Christ; that is still present in all men, this not yet existing in all, though it might and should be; that is found without the Church also, this begins only within it; the former is the starting-point for the latter, the latter is the result of the reviving of the former obtained in Christ; that is the first creation, conceived in retrospect, this the "new creature," conceived as rising; the former is accordingly of *nature*, which God in holy love has created, preserved and guided, the latter of *grace*, in which He has had mercy upon the former. But universal as the need of redemption and the capacity for redemption are, man is, on account of this need and in spite of this capability, not in a condition to *win* the gracious right of sonship, or *obligated thereto* (SCHENKEL), but on account of this need notwithstanding this capability only in a state to receive the gift of renewed sonship. See *Exeg. Notes*, ver. 16.

4. In the *economy of salvation*,—in which our passage, being addressed to believers, presupposes justification and antecedent repentance, and regards only the growing renewal, the strengthening of the inner man, his growth in the grace and truth of Christ—the Father constantly, at every stage, takes the initiative, and the recovering man takes no step forward without power received from God. Hence the supplication, that He would "grant" and that too "through His Spirit" to the inner man: thus the renewal within begins from above. Then the awakened, renewed power of the inner man appears in faith, in dependence draws Christ into himself, into his heart, as a guest into his house, for continued intercourse with Him, carefully directing himself by Him in all respects. The inner man, when once he has actually, with saving effect, become the *object* (εἰς) of the working of the *Holy Ghost*, becomes the *subject* of transforming activity in *faith*, which like a screw binds Christ to the soul. Though we may not, with the mystics, accept a union *essentialis et corporalis*, still we should not, with the rationalists, deny the *conjunctio substantiæ hominis fidelis cum substantia sanctæ trinitatis* and affirm only a dynamic or operative presence of Christ.

5. *The work* of salvation is a difficult one, and demands the power of God and man. *Of God:* hence Paul prays (ver. 16): "that he would grant you according to the riches of His glory." Of *man:* hence ver. 18: "that ye may be fully able."

6. *Knowledge and Love are not to be separated.* There is not merely an "illumination" before conversion and repentance, but also after justification through faith. In the enjoyment of the love of Christ, which we experience, our love is strengthened, forgetting itself and yet with a profound remembrance of itself it knows what it has experienced, denying itself it is thus strengthened to a clear knowledge of the love of Christ. Human things one must know, in order to love but Divine things one must love, in order to know (PASCAL). Love, hastening before, ever gains new material and light for knowledge. "The more I love, the more I *find* that I ought to love Thee."

7. *The connection of faith and love* is also presupposed here, and in such a way that the former is the mother's lap for the latter; the faith in that love of God in Christ, which we experience and enjoy, must impel to love, to love in return again and again.

8. *Christ's Love* surpasses all knowledge and understanding, that only toilsomely attains to seeing. HOFMANN: "There is really but one love in the world, because but one actual entering in of person into person. The eternally personal God, who is Love, who has entered into humanity as the personal Christ, who in the Holy Ghost personally flows into the personal life of men, so that we *have Him* and *are His*, He loves and is loved. Only where this archetypal fountain of love exists, can man exercise toward his fellow man a copied love." Only so far as it is felt, can it be known in our weakness.

9. *The completion of fellowship with* God points into eternity, from the militant to the triumphant church; there the children become heritors,

are taken on His throne and heart. Here many radial lines already proceed from the circumference, grace, peace and joy, truth and freedom, sonship and the sense of sonship, life-power and life-fulness, yet they come together in the center only above. Let us only hold fast to the unity of the family of God in heaven and on earth, the oneness of the Father through Christ in the Holy Ghost.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Had not the Apostle said so, no one would have discovered from his tone, that he was in bonds and chains, looking death in the face. To him affliction is a clear winter night, in which the stars of promise only shine the brighter. Has he tears in his eyes, they become a telescope to carry his sight into the far distant heavens, to open heaven to him and permit him to gaze into the depth of its wonders. It does not occur to him, to pray for release; he asks only for the perfecting and ennobling of the church.—In outward woe he thinks, feels and prays about inward weal alone; in evil, that concerns himself, about the good of the church alone.—God, the true Father, is not nearer to heaven with its angels and saints than to earth with its sons of men; were we but nearer to Him!—He is the Rich One, who can and will give; we are the poor ones, who should receive and—*will not!*—It were better if thou didst not care so much how to adorn the outer man through the spirit of the world and of fashion; God can through His Spirit re-animate and strengthen the inner man.—Above all see how it stands within thee, so that what God has created after His image in thee be not stunted and starved out. Thine outer man may laugh and sing and dance, while the inner man laments and sighs and goes to destruction.

Christ wishes to dwell with thee, not as a mere passing guest; so order thy work and recreation and mode of life after His example, that it may please Him to dwell there and not to hasten away. He is willing to belong to thee; it is not enough then that thou hearest Him, hearkenest to Him, thou must also belong to Him as His possession, must submit thyself and all thou hast to His disposal.—Bind thyself in faith to Him and hold communion with those who believe in Him, that thou mayest grow in the knowledge of His love. Root thyself ever deeper in that love, ground thyself ever more firmly upon it.—Do like Ernest the Pious, who in 1636 had a medal struck in commemoration of his marriage with Elizabeth Sophia of Altenburg, with this inscription on the one side: *Christum lieben ist das beste wissen* (Loving Christ is the best knowledge), and on the other: *Gott, lehr erkennen mich und Dich* (God, teach me to know myself and Thee)!—Holy love alone lets us understand and use the Scriptures ever better and better! If we look at God's word and world without love; we see them only remotely.—Three-fold aim of Christian supplication: 1. Strengthening of the inner man; 2. Knowledge of the love of Christ; 3. Fulness of Divine glory.

STARKE:—In praying the outward posture is indeed of little importance; it is left to Christian liberty to take this or that position with the body; yet no kind of posture seems better fitted for fervent, earnest prayer, than kneeling.—Thou hast indeed a merciful, gracious and loving Father: Thinkest thou, He can ever forsake thee? That is an idle thought. As little as He can take Love out of His heart so little can He forget thee. See, what is the best thing a teacher can ask for his flock; but also what thou too, O soul, must seek after, to be strengthened through the Spirit of God in the inner man.—It is not enough to have come into a state of grace through conversion, there must be added a strengthening and fortifying, which however is not the work of man, since Christ is the Author and Finisher of our faith. Though our sins were so broad, so long, so deep, so high, as heaven and earth, yet is the grace and mercy of God deeper, broader, higher and longer, so that it cannot be measured.—The mystery of the love of God is incomprehensible: in future perfection we will understand it. Because we still await that time, let us meanwhile imitate such love in its depth, by helping those who are in the deepest misery and least deserving; in its breadth, by showing to all men without distinction, for God's sake, kindness and affection, in its length, by never ceasing or becoming weary; in its height, by looking up to God, devoting to Him all our efforts, and having His glory as our purpose.—In Christianity more depends upon taking in faith, than upon giving and doing in love. For the more we take of the fulness of God, the more we can give.

A. MUELLER:—He who lets Christ dwell in his heart, only that he may have from Him a household blessing or a joyful consolation, *sells* Him his heart; but he who surrenders himself to Christ out of pure love, at the same time thinking himself unworthy of the least look of His grace, *gives* Him his heart.

RIEGER:—God oftentimes indeed begins in a very small way in His works of grace, because He will effect nothing according to absolute power, but so as to lead men to faith and obedience.—Christ dwelling in the heart and His Spirit lay claim also to the members of the body, putting them into the service of righteousness, to bring forth fruit unto God in holiness.—Being rooted and grounded in love we obtain the ability to comprehend, not merely to know, but also with other powers of soul so to appropriate something as to be filled therewith. Faith widens the heart, so that more and more can be grasped. But with these enlarged views, which are imparted to us, we should not sunder ourselves from other saints, nor attach to anything such an immoderate value, as to sever the bond which unites us with other saints, but apply all to the edification of the body of Christ.

HEUBNER:—It is a truly proud misery of Kant's, his denying kneeling as a slavish Orientalism. He can scarcely have felt the impulse of a praying heart. Lichtenberg judges very differently, when he says: "When the body falls upon its knees, the spirit lifts itself to God."—We have too little bending of the knee; the Catholics perhaps too much, so that a Catholic may occasionally be recognized by the looks of his clothes at the knees. Spener wished that

kneeling devotion was more common among us.—What a comfort for fatherless children and widows, what hope for affectionate fathers, to know that their dear children have in heaven a better Father than themselves. Still the human relation can best teach the true "Father-theology."—A church can be good outwardly and apparently and yet be without inward life. This inward life comes from the Spirit of God. Christianity should be learned not by heart, but in the heart. *—Christ will dwell, not in stone churches, but in living hearts; the heart should live and move in Him, His Spirit should animate our spirit in constant intercourse with Him.—When Christ dwells in the heart, every one has his Christ in his neighbor.—*Breadth:* the Church of Christ should stretch itself over the whole circle of the earth, over all lands. The *length* refers to time; she continues throughout all centuries. The *depth* points to her foundation; she has it in the unfathomable abyss of Divine mercy, and her *height* reaches into heaven, it is unassailable, for the church on earth and in the spirit world is one. This is the greatness and the origin of the spiritual temple.—Love to Christ, a simple heart full of faith and love to Him, is better than all science. This love has an unconditioned value, is in itself the highest: not so with knowledge; it can give a kind of enlightenment, without at all affecting the heart. The heart excels the understanding. Science should not be over-estimated, and made an idol. Science can never conquer the enemies of the Kingdom of God, she should be a handmaid. The true science is only where the cross is. Only the *theologus crucis* is the *theologus lucis.*

Passavant:—With a narrow heart we cannot pray with confidence. Hence everything demands that we should receive Divine riches, which enlightens our mind, expands our heart and makes God great in us.—How worthy of admiration, how highly exalted above man is this *inner man* of the heart! Faith is his reason and his light; love his heart and his life; the Holy Ghost his soul and strength; Jesus Christ his ego and his nature; God his Father and at the same time his heritage, his glory, his riches, his eternal dwelling-place; God makes him, His work in His own good time, and this through a power whose working corresponds with the riches and the glory of His grace.—Did Christ dwell in us, what would we become to our friends, to our enemies, to the world, to the heavens!—Only the Spirit of God in us can disclose to us what God is; only faith, through the Holy Ghost, can apprehend Christ and His life in us; only pure, holy love in us can comprehend what is transcendent and blissful, the wonders of the love of God in Jesus Christ.—There is a breadth and length and depth and height; for this no worlds are too broad, no paths too long, no space too wide, no abyss, no hell too deep, no heaven too high, that it may not reach thither, and penetrate there with might and almightiness, with light and life, with comfort and salvation and peace from eternal compassion—"fulness of God" the destination and end of man, the aim and end of all the decrees of God, of all the mysteries of Christ. Canst thou not satisfy man? Must he still fill himself with a thousand trifles besides, that his happiness may be complete?

Stier:—The *higher* his petition seeks to ascend above all understanding to Him, who is able to do above all, the *deeper* he bows himself.—The indwelling of Christ: Its *beginning*—through faith; *means*—Christ's love, which becomes ours; *aim*—according to the widest extension of the plan (knowledge) and inmost depths of the foundation (Christ's love).

Gerlach:—The love of Christ to us precedes all our love and knowledge.

Nitzsch:—*The essential petition,* which we, each for all and all for each, should bear in our hearts, during the varieties and vicissitudes of our life-path. 1. *Its purport: a*) To become strong in the inner man; *b*) To have vital fellowship with the Redeemer; *c*) To know His love. 2. *The effect.*

Wolters (*Dedication sermon at Godesberg*): The proper prayer for a young congregation: 1) that its members become strong in the inner man: 2) that Christ lives in their hearts; 3) that they understand His love in its greatness and blessedness.

Genzken (*Preparatory Lecture** on Eph. iii. 13–21): St. Paul our example in prayer. 1) He bows his knees, so we under the burden of our guilt; 2) He addresses himself to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; so there is no other name for us; 3) He asks power for the inner man to strengthen in faith, in love, and for every good work; so we.

Löhe:—St. Paul's request to the Ephesians, his prayer to God, his song of praise to Him, all in relation to the great mystery of building the church on earth.

Westermeier:—*The best prayer:* 1) to whom it is addressed; 2) the gifts it desires; 3) the basis on which it rests.

Kluge:—Seek the kingdom of God, not in external things, but in the inner man—1) in judging of the contest of the gospel against the world; 2) of the blessing of the gospel in yourselves.

Rabus:—A glance into the closet of the Apostle: 1) How we should *approach* God in prayer; 2) how *supplicate* Him; 3) how *praise* Him.

Rautenberg:—What Paul does in his tribulations, that his disciples may not become weary in the walk of faith: 1) He is far from them—yet sends them his mighty word; 2) He suffers the contempt of the world—but endures it for their glory; 3) He cannot give them his hand, but he bows his knee for them.

Dr. Meier (*Baptismal discourse* on ver. 18): On the breadth, length, depth, height of the love of God.

Pröhle:—Paul's pious wish for the Church at Ephesus: 1. That they might not become weary in their Christian course (ver. 13). 2.

* [The German has a similar paranomasia: *Man soll das Christenthum nicht auswendig, sondern inwendig lernen.*—R.]

* [*Beichtrede* is literally a discourse at *confession,* but among Protestants means the service preparatory to the communion, during the previous week. The etymology confirms the view, that our preparatory lecture is borrowed from the Romanist usage of confessing before the communion, though in reality a proper mode of obeying the injunction: Let a man examine himself.—R.]

That God would give them power to become strong in the inner man (vers. 14-16). 3. That Christ may dwell in their hearts (ver. 17). 4. That they may be able to comprehend with all saints the breadth=the universality, embracing all, the length=the endlessness from eternity to eternity, the depth and height=the immeasurable and incomprehensible greatness of the love of Christ.

[Hodge:—The most beautiful object might be in the apartment of a blind man, and he not be sensible of its presence; or if by any means made aware of its nearness, he could have no delight in its beauty. Christ dwells in us by faith, because it is by faith we perceive His presence, His excellence and His glory, and because it is by faith we appropriate and reciprocate the manifestations of His love. Faith is to this spiritual communion what esteem and affection are to the fellowship of domestic life.—The love of Christ is infinite; not only because it inheres in an infinite subject, but because the condescension and sufferings to which it led, and the blessings which it secures for its objects, are beyond our comprehension.—R.]

[Eadie:—Ver. 15. They lose the cold and official name of subjects in the familiar and endearing appellation of sons, and they are united to one another not dimly and unconsciously, as different products of the same Divine workmanship, but they merge into one family—"all they are brethren."—Ver. 17. When Ignatius was asked, on his trial, by the Emperor, what was the meaning of his name—Theophorus—he promptly replied, "He who has Christ in his breast."—Love is the fundamental grace.—Ver. 19. As the attachment of a man, it may be gauged; but as the love of a God, who can by searching find it out? Uncaused itself, it originated salvation; unresponded to amidst the "contradiction of sinners," it neither pined nor collapsed. It led from Divine immortality to human agonies and dissolution, for the victim was bound to the cross, not by the nails of the military executioner, but by the "cords of love." It loved repulsive unloveliness, and, unnourished by reciprocated attachment, its ardor was unquenched, nay, is unquenchable, for it is changeless as the bosom in which it dwells. Thus it may be known, while yet it "passeth knowledge;" thus it may be experimentally known, while still in its origin and glory it surpasses comprehension, and presents new and newer phases to the loving and inquiring spirit. For one may drink of the spring and be refreshed, and his eye may take in at one view its extent and circuit, while he may be able neither to fathom the depth nor mete out the volume of the ocean whence it has its origin.—R.]

3. *Conclusion in the form of a Doxology.*

(Chap. III. 20, 21).

20 Now unto [to] him that [who] is able to do [above all things], exceeding abun-
dantly above all that [above what] we ask or think, according to the power that
21 worketh in us, Unto [to] him *be* [the] glory in the church by [in][1] Christ Jesus
throughout all ages, world without end [*lit.*, unto all the generations of the age of
the ages]. Amen.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 21.—After ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ℵ. A. B. C. insert καὶ before ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. A few authorities [D.[1] F.] read: ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ (ἐν) τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, evidently from doctrinal hesitation about placing the church before Christ; in single minor authorities ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ is wanting. This arises from the inappropriate καί, which only disturbs, and although well supported externally, is inadmissible on internal grounds. It may be rejected, and is rejected by Tischendorf, on the authority of a number of important MSS. [These are D.[2] K. L., besides the great majority of cursives, oldest versions, and many fathers. Rejected by Tischendorf, Meyer, and most, bracketted by Alford, accepted by Lachmann, Ellicott (ed. 3, 4 only). Before the discovery of ℵ. the internal grounds were sufficiently strong to outweigh the preponderant uncial testimony in its favor, but now the question is more doubtful. The sense is not affected materially by the variation, though the insertion precludes one interpretation. The word may have been inserted to indicate the other meaning, hence its omission presents a *lectio difficilior*.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

In general the *doxology* is frequent, either at the *beginning* (i. 3-14; 1 Pet. i. 3-5), or at the *close* of an Epistle (Rom. xvi. 25-27; Phil. iv. 20; 2 Tim. iv. 18; 1 Pet. v. 11; Jude 25; Heb. xiii. 21), or at the close of a section, as here, Rom. xi. 33-36; Gal. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 17.

Ver. 20. **Now to him who is able to do above all things**—Τῷ δὲ* δυναμένῳ stands emphatically first, because the matter in hand is the manifestation of God's power and almightiness (ver. 16: δυνάμει, ver. 18: ἐξισχύσητε). With the infinitive ποιῆσαι ["to do," to effect], we must closely connect ὑπὲρ πάντα, "above all," under which we should understand

* [Alford: "δέ brings out a slight contrast to what has just preceded—viz., *ourselves*, and our need of strength and our growth in knowledge and fulness," but the contrast is not strong enough to justify our rendering the particle: "but."—R.]

creatures, powers and events, which may act in a hindering, disturbing or destructive way.

Exceeding abundantly above what we ask or think [ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν].—In this added qualification the Apostle places God's almightiness in comparison with his prayer, and that in a most striking manner. Hence ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ, found also in 1 Thes. iii. 10, v. 13 [?]. Similar expressions, strengthening the sense, occur in Eph. i. 21; iv. 10; Rom. v. 20; 2 Cor. vii. 4, 13; xi. 5; xii. 11; 1 Tim. i. 14; Mark vii. 37; xiv. 31; vi. 51. In its comparative signification it governs, as in ver. 19: ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως, the genitive ὧν, which is = τῶν ἃ αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν. BENGEL: *Cogitatio latius patet quam preces; gradatio.* God is greater than our heart (1 John iii. 20). CHRYSOSTOM: ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ εὔχομαι, αὐτὸς δὲ καὶ χωρὶς τῆς ἐμῆς εὐχῆς μείζονα ἐργάσεται τῶν ἡμετέρων αἰτήσεων οὐχ ἁπλῶς μείζονα ἢ ἐκ περισσοῦ ἀλλ' ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ, τὸ μέγεθος ἐμφαίνων τῆς δωρεᾶς.

[The relative does not refer to πάντα; it introduces a new but related subject. The two phrases are not in apposition, but the second member explains the first. There is no tautology therefore, since subjoined to the expression of God's super-abundant power, we have a definition of the mode in which it displays itself, *viz.*, by conferring spiritual gifts in super-abundance (EADIE). There is no hyperbole as HARLESS thinks, though Paul has such a marked predilection for ὑπέρ and its compounds; it "occurs nearly thrice as many times in Paul's Epistles and that to the Hebrews as in the rest of the New Testament; and of the 28 words compounded with ὑπέρ, 22 are found in these Epistles, and 20 of them there alone."—R.]

According to the power that worketh [or **is working**] **in us**, κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν.—This belongs to the phrase: "able to do." The *present* middle participle marks the continued efficiency of His power, while "in us" indicates both the object and the sphere of activity. *Paulus allegat experientiam* (BENGEL) and full of confidence turns from the beginning to the future. Comp. Col. i. 29. Miraculous gifts (MICHAEL) are not referred to, nor should ὑπὲρ πάντα, "above all," be limited to *quæ hactenus visa sunt* (GROTIUS), or the preposition ὑπὲρ be taken adverbially (BENGEL), as in 2 Cor. xi. 23 alone. [The power, so frequently referred to in this Epistle, is the might of the indwelling Spirit. The *middle* (comp. Gal. v. 6) is used mainly in non-personal references; see WINER, p. 242.—R.]

Ver. 21. **To him be the glory**, αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα.—The pronoun sums up vigorously and emphatically what is predicated in ver. 20. The dative denotes that the glory is due, will be given to Him (Luke xvii. 18; John ix. 24; Acts xii. 23; Rom. iv. 20; 1 Pet. i. 21; Acts iv. 9, xi. 13; xiv. 7; xvi. 9; xix. 7). [So most commentators]. Accordingly the article, ἡ δόξα, does not indicate the "glory," which He has (HARLESS); in that case the pronoun αὐτοῦ would occur, as in the interpolated doxology at the close of the Lord's prayer: ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία, κ. τ. λ. But it is the glory of the church, which indeed she has first from God, but which as received from Him, properly His and yet appropriated by her, she returns to Him with gratitude and praise. It is not = ἔπαινος, *praise*, which consists in words, nor = τιμή, *honor*, which consists in the judgment of those who praise, but refers to the life, worship, and character of the church. Comp. i. 12, 14: εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, "unto the praise of his glory." It is most natural to supply ἔστω.

In the church in Christ Jesus, [ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ].—The preposition ἐν before τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ points to the sphere in which the glory of God is given back, defining more closely either the omitted ἔστω or ἡ δόξα. By ἡ ἐκκλησία, "the church," we should understand the assembly of those in whom God's power has become efficient and works (ver. 20: "in us"); it is accordingly no external region (MEYER), which is indifferent internally, and beside which an inner spiritual sphere is to be indicated (ἐν Χριστῷ); the church is indeed herself such a sphere. Hence the phrase "in Christ Jesus," defines more closely the church, its character and status, in order to explain, in what church the glory can and shall be given to God. Luther has rendered it properly as one notion: *die in Christo Jesu lebendige Gemeinde* (the church alive in Christ Jesus).

[To this interpretation, which is that of OLSHAUSEN, STIER and others, it is properly objected that such a definition of the church is altogether unnecessary. If καί be accepted (see *Textual Note*) this exegesis is inadmissible. Nor is the view of MEYER (with HARLESS, DE WETTE, EADIE, HODGE, ALFORD and ELLICOTT) open to the objection urged by Braune that it presents an external region internally indifferent. The sphere of the giving of glory is defined in a twofold manner: "It is offered in the church, but it is, at the same time offered 'in Christ Jesus,' or presented by the members of the sacred community in the consciousness of union with Him" (EADIE); "if any glory comes from us to God it is in Christ." The repetition of ἐν seems to point to such a meaning, even if καί be omitted. —R.] Hence it is not = to διὰ Χριστοῦ (GROTIUS); comp. Col. iii. 17; Rom. i. 18; vii. 25. [CALVIN, BEZA and RUECKERT: *per Christum;* E. V.: "by Christ Jesus;" σὺν Χριστῷ (ŒCUMENIUS), all alike objectionable, for even the instrumental sense of ἐν is not exactly = διά, and the proper sense of the preposition is the more necessary because it occurs for the second time. —R.]

Unto all the generations of the age of the ages, [εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν].—The phrase εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεάς designates the successive groups which are added to this church; γενεαί designates the groups of living persons. Now, at the time when Paul writes, the beginning has been made, the first γενεά, "generation," which reflects Godward the glory, the light in and from His light, is present; and thus it should and will continue, hence εἰς, "unto." It is = εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεάν, or εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν (Luke i. 50, various reading); this repetition expressing the same idea as πᾶσαι; "the iterative form of the expression indicated the extension" (HARLESS).

The phrase *τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων* defines to what these *γενεαί* belong and extend, *in omnes generationes, quæ complectitur ὁ αἰών, qui terminatur in τοὺς αἰῶνας perpetuos* (BENGEL). Ὁ *αἰών* marks the unity or totality of passing time, which at the same time includes eternity. We have no word which indicates both, as the Greeks had. [True in both English and German]. BENGEL: *αἰῶνες periodi œconomiæ divinæ ab una quasi scena ad aliam decurrentes; hic amplificantur causa utrumque vocabulum, cum metaphora in γενεά, generatio, conjungitur, ut significetur tempus bene longum; nam in αἰῶσι non jam sunt* GENERATIONES. Paul says therefore, that the church now begun shall continue through a long series of generations; begun on earth it will be developed throughout these generations, and even when generations shall cease, shall continue in *æons*, without succession of generations, and these generations and those *æons* (in which new generations are not added, but the constituent ones continue permanently) form a whole, one *αἰών*, the *αἰὼν μέλλων*. Instead of this full formula we find only *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, Rom. i. 25; ix. 5; xi. 36; xvi. 27; Luke i. 33; 2 Cor. xi. 31; or *αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*, 1 Tim. i. 17; 1 Pet. v. 11. Rev. i. 6, 18; iv. 9, 10, *etc.*; *εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας*, Jude 25; *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, Matth. xxi. 19; Mark xi. 14, *etc.*; *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος*, Heb. i. 8. Comp. *Doctr. Notes*, 5, 6.

[Only the most extravagant literalism can exclude the idea of eternity from this cumulative expression, and only the most forced exegesis can include "distinct traces of gnosticism." HARLESS makes a subtle distinction between *αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων* and *αἰὼν τῶν αἰώνων*, taking the former as more extensive, the latter intensive, for which there is little room here. MEYER is perhaps too literal in his view of *γενεαί*, which Braune apparently adopts. ALFORD is satisfactory: "Probably the account of the meaning is, that the *age* of ages (eternity) is conceived as containing ages, just as our 'age' contains years; and then those ages are thought of as made up, like ours, of generations. It is used, by a transfer of what we know in time, to express, imperfectly and indeed improperly, the idea of Eternity."—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *God's Omnipotence* is unlimited, if we leave out of view His own *will:* He can do what He will (Ps. cxv. 3).

2. God's power works *in* His people (*ἐν ὑμῖν*, ver. 20), not merely *over* them, and *about* them; for they do not resist Him with that will which He has given from His own will to those created in His image. He will not, with His omnipotence, force any into the Church in Christ Jesus, into salvation. Man has might to resist God's Almightiness within himself. [The limitation or extension of meaning which theologians of different schools may put upon this last sentence, need not be discussed here. Given free-will, the sacred right of personality, and it is true in some sense—awfully true, since this is the fearful price of our privilege as free men. *How* God's Almightiness, notwithstanding, never fails of its purpose, we do not know; *that* it never does, lies at the foundation of all proper theology.—R.]

3. The *Essence of worship* is the thankful return of what God has bestowed and the recipient has accepted and appropriated; hence the approach of the recipient to the Bestower, in gratitude for the gift, praise for the Giver; the deepest ground of adoration is, however, the condescending grace and imparting love of the Almighty God. He who is blessed begins to bless the Blesser (i. 3) and ends in praise of the God of glory (iii. 20, 21).

4. *The true Church, a creation of God* (ver. 20), a living congregation, an assembly of sanctified persons, is *Christian*, having and needing no other Mediator than Christ Jesus, proving and defining the relation to the church according to the relation to Him.

5. *The Christian Church has a history*, a development through a long series of generations even into eternity. HOFMANN (*Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 127) retains the *καί* before *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* and thinks the glorifying of God "in the church" takes place only in time and on earth, but "in Christ" eternally, as though the church were a temporal thing and nothing more. [EADIE: "The obligation to glorify God lasts through eternity, and the glorified church will ever delight in rendering praise, 'as is most due.' Eternal perfection will sustain an eternal anthem."—R.]

6. The Church of Jesus Christ does not find her final issue in the State (ROTHE), or in a higher grade of culture;* she has a rising without a setting. Rescued through all the changes of national life, she is herself the rescuer of individuals, and of larger groups as well, unto the future of eternity.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Prayer is no limit to God's working in thee, but a condition, which He Himself has appointed, without which thou canst not experience His almighty grace.—Thou art a creature of God, and shouldst become a work of His, praising the Master hand in word and deed, and above all in private character and conduct.—"Exceeding abundantly!" Hagar asked a drop and found a well (Gen. xxi. 19); Saul sought his father's asses and found a crown (1 Sam. ix. 3; x. 1); David asked bread and received a kingdom (1 Sam. xxi. 3).

STARKE: God does more than we desire. Joseph wishes only to be free from the iron chains: behold, God not only does what he desires, but gives him golden chains besides.

HEUBNER:—In the synagogues, mosques, and pagodas there is no true praise of God, nor yet in our churches, if Christ be not known.—*The prayer of Paul for the church* (vers. 13–21). 1. It was prompted by the impulse of love (ver. 13). 2. Full of confidence toward God, the Father of all churches (vers. 14, 15). 3. It was holy in its purport (vers. 16-19). 4. Hopeful,

* [When De Wette asks: "Was the Apostle warranted in expecting such a long duration for the Church?" he proves his utter want of sympathy with this Epistle, and abundantly justifies the criticism made on his commentary by ALFORD (see *Introd.* § 3, 5).—R.]

certain of hearing (vers. 20, 21).—*God the true Father.* 1. Exposition: *a*) He is not only the physical Creator and Upholder, but *b*) spiritual Father (vers. 14-16). 2. Ground of our belief in this: *a*) not mere reason and experience, but *b*) the gospel of Christ (vers. 17, 18). 3. Power of this belief: *a*) it attracts our heart to God (ver. 18), so that we understand God's heart, *b*) it strengthens unto obedience, *c*) it gives comfort and hope (vers. 19–21).—The intimate fellowship of the Apostles and their churches as an example for us.—The inner growth of a Christian church.

RIEGER: What occurs to each one at his conversion and during his daily renewal, is as good an evidence of the "exceeding abundant" power of God, as what occurs in the creation, preservation and government of all things.

[EADIE:—The Trinity is here again brought out to view. The power within us is that of the Spirit, and glory in Christ is presented to the Father who answers prayer through the Son, and by the Spirit; and, therefore, to the Father, in the Son, and by the Spirit, is offered this glorious minstrelsy: "As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen."—R.]

III. PART SECOND.

THE SPIRIT RULING IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

CHAPTERS IV.–VI. 20.

1. The Theme of the Whole Part:

Walk worthy of the calling love and unity.

CHAP. IV. 1–3.

1 I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you [I exhort you therefore, I the prisoner in the Lord,][1] that ye walk worthy of the vocation [calling] wherewith ye
2 are [were] called, With all lowliness and meekness,[2] with long-suffering, forbearing
3 one another in love; Endeavoring [Earnestly striving] to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 1.—Nearly all MSS. have: ἐν κυρίῳ; ℵ.: ἐν Χριστῷ. [The change of order is for the purpose of bringing out the emphatic force of παρακαλῶ (*exhort* rather than *beseech*); the second *I* being required in English. *In* is substituted for *of* as more correct, while *calling* is in itself a better word than *vocation*, serving here to preserve the correspondence between the substantive and verb (aorist: *were* called).—R.]

[2] Ver. 2.—[The spelling πραΰτητος (ℵ. B. C. 17) is considered by Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott, as the best attested form in the dialect of the New Testament. Comp. Gal. v. 23. Braune apparently prefers πραότητος (*Rec.*, A. D. F. L., most cursives). His rendering of the three terms is very neat: *mit aller Demuth und Sanftmuth, mit Langmuth.*—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1 *a. The connection.* **I exhort you therefore, I the prisoner in the Lord** [Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ ὁ δέσμιος ἐν κυρίῳ].—The verb παρακαλῶ, placed first for emphasis, marks what follows as the ethical part. Οὖν, "therefore," joins this practical, hortatory portion of the letter with the previous theoretical part, and that too as a consequence, so that the one forms a foundation for the other; the context indicating the reference more closely.—Ὁ δέσμιος, "the prisoner," resumes what was expressed in iii. 1 and continued further in vers. 13, 14. As Paul in his bonds prays for the Church, so he exhorts it also. Although the paronomasia (παρακαλῶ—κλήσεως) recalls ἐκκλησία, yet the reference is not to ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ver. 21, but to the whole of what precedes (τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ has occurred already in i. 22), which is, however, summed up in the concluding doxology. Hence MEYER is incorrect in taking οὖν as an inference from iii. 21 merely.* The exhortation of the Apostle gives special emphasis to ἐγώ, "I," even though it stands after ὑμᾶς, "you," in the Greek. The phrase, ὁ δέσμιος

* [EADIE accepts a reference to the preceding paragraph; ALFORD to all that precedes so (HODGE), but adds: "here perhaps also a resumption of τούτου χάριν of chap. iii. 1, 14, and thus carried back to the contents of chaps. i. ii." ELLICOTT: "To those passages in the preceding chapter which relate to the spiritual privileges and calling of the Ephesians, *e. g.*, vers. 6, 12, but especially to ver. 14 ff., in which the tenor of the prayer incidentally discloses how high and how great that calling really was." The objection to the more general reference in my mind is, that it assumes the Epistle to have been by the Apostle himself purposely divided into two parts, *doctrinal* and *practical*, like the divisions of a sermon. Paul's method is rathor that of *concatenation*.—R.]

ἐν κυρίῳ,* "the prisoner in the Lord" (which can be taken together grammatically, and must be taken together in view of the reference to iii. 1), marks the importance of the exhortation of Paul, who as a "faithful member of Christ" bears chains in and for the cause of Christ. CALVIN: *Erant (vincula) enim veluti sigillum honorificæ illius legationis, quam obtinuerat.* THEODORET: *Τοῖς διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν δεσμοῖς ἐναβρύνεται μᾶλλον ἢ βασιλεὺς διαδήματι.* He is a shining example, and elsewhere he refers to his own walk in agreement with his preaching (1 Cor. iv. 16; xi. 1; Phil. iii. 17); he speaks accordingly *ad excitandum effectum, quo sit efficacior exhortatio* (ESTIUS), but not *ut Paulum obsequio exhilararent* (BENGEL). He wishes to gain attention and efficacy for his *παρακαλεῖν*, by appealing, not to his imprisonment, which in itself was incapable of strengthening his exhortation, but to his willing, joyful, worthy wearing of the bonds; thus at the same time also strongly urging self-denial. The verb itself means originally *to call hither*, to invite (Acts xviii. 20); then *to address* either hortatively (Rom. xii. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 8) or *consolingly* (2 Cor. ii. 7; i. 6; vii. 6, 7). Ὑμᾶς, "you," designates the Church in its individual members; he always conceives of the Church as a fellowship of particular persons.

The fundamental exhortation. Ver. 1 *b*.

That ye walk worthy of the calling [ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι τῆς κλήσεως.—The infinitive περιπατῆσαι (see ii. 2), as in Acts xxvii. 33, 34, sets forth the purport of the exhortation. The emphasis, of course, rests upon the closer qualification ἀξίως ("worthy"), which stands first; for the kind of walk is the important matter. The genitive (as in Phil. i. 27; Col. i. 10; Rom. xvi. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 12) τῆς κλήσεως denotes that call of God, to which the walk must correspond, in order to be worthy.

Wherewith ye were called, ἧς (instead of ᾗ, 1 Cor. vii. 20) ἐκλήθητε.†—This relative clause joined *per attractionem* (see on i. 8) indicates that the call has already taken place and been accepted. He speaks of a walk corresponding to the call already received, not as though we should walk worthy, in order to be called, but, since we are called through the grace of God without our merit or worthiness, we should not be unworthy of such grace (CALVIN).

Comp. vers. 17–30; ii. 10; Tit. ii. 11 ff.; Rom. viii. 4 ff.; Gal. v. 19 ff.

Closer definition of the Christian walk; vers. 2, 3.

Ver. 2. **With all lowliness and meekness** [μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ πραΰτητος. See *Textual Note* [2]].—This clause defines more closely "walk worthy of the calling," joining with it two attendants which belong to the Christian walk (WINER, p. 353).* First stands "lowliness," which has for its opposite "minding high things" (Rom. xii. 16), "thinking one's self to be something" (Gal. vi. 3); it is πάσης ἀρετῆς ὑποθέσις (CHRYSOSTOM). Comp. Phil. ii. 3; Col. ii. 18, 23; iii. 12, 13. It is belief in our poverty over against faith in Christ, so that we know we have nothing, know nothing, can do nothing, having only an empty hand, yet an open one, to receive what the Lord will give. Accordingly, as in Matt. v. 3, 4, 5, to "the poor in spirit" and "they that mourn" (=οἱ ταπεινοφρονοῦντες) are joined "the meek," so here "meekness," πραΰτης, is added, that mildness which is gentle toward others, because it thinks: Have I been helped, then I do not know, who should not be helped! Comp. Gal. vi. 1; 2 Cor. x. 1; 1 Cor. iv. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 25. [See TRENCH, *Syn. N. T.* § xlii., perhaps the most discriminating essay on these words which can be found.† —R.] The adjective πάσης, "all," denotes all the various relations and situations of lowliness and meekness; the former must manifest itself in both intellectual and ethical spheres, before God and men, the latter toward friend and foe, under violations of our own rights and property as well as those of our neighbor.

With long-suffering, μετὰ μακροθυμίας, is co-ordinate in form with the other two, standing closely connected, yet taken up by itself. Long-suffering (Matt. xviii. 26, 29; 1 Cor. xiii. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 6; Gal. v. 22) is a manifestation of meekness; much depends upon it frequently in the life of a church. Hence it accords with the context to distinguish this by a second μετά and to conjoin it to the other terms. [The word means, not taking swift vengeance or inflicting speedy punishment, though it becomes more general in its sense=forbearance of every kind. The pointing of the E. V. is correct, making the phrase a separate clause. Besides the objection which Braune urges below against connecting it with what follows we may add, that thus the phrase would receive undue emphasis and the parallelism of the participial clauses be disturbed. —R.]

Forbearing one another in love [ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ].—We would expect the accusative here instead of the nominative: παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς—περιπατῆσαι—ἀνεχομένους. It is not however the ὑμᾶς, "you," which

---

* [The choice of this phrase here, following iii. 1, where the genitive occurs, is overlooked in the E. V. Ἐν is not here =διά or σύν (it is doubtful if it ever is), but denotes the sphere or element of the captivity. As distinguished from iii. 1, this passage gives prominence to the fellowship with Christ and devotion to His cause, while the genitive marks Christ more definitely as the author or originator of the captivity. "In the Lord" seems to be at times, ELLICOTT remarks, little more than a qualitative definition, yet there is far more danger of abridging than extending its profound spiritual significance.—The phrase cannot be joined with the verb, as is done by SEMLER and KOPPE.—R.]

† [MEYER thinks the attraction is from the accusative ἥν, though admitting that a dative might be proper here. DE WETTE denies the propriety of the expression κλῆσιν καλεῖν (*cognate accusative*), though it is defended by WINER, p. 154, and occurs in Arrian, *Epict.*: καταισχύνειν τὴν κλῆσιν ἣν κέκληκεν. The dative gives the simpler grammatical form and through a slight violation of the law of attraction, is sustained by the analogy of 2 Tim. i. 9; 1 Cor. v. 20 is not decisive since ἐν with the dative precedes and the relative *might be* attracted into that case, though it probably *is* not. —R.]

* [Σύν denotes coherence, often with the same idea of assistance; μετά refers to an accompaniment or attendant.—R.]

† [TRENCH properly objects to CHRYSOSTOM's proud humility, which shows itself in his definition of the first term: "making ourselves small when we are great," defining it rather: "the esteeming ourselves small, inasmuch as we are so: the thinking truly, lowlily of ourselves."—The second term is more than *gentleness*, to which Braune and HODGE seem to limit it; it rests on the former as its foundation, accepting God's dealings in humility, and manifesting itself toward men, because they are His instruments.—R.]

is to be more closely defined, but the "walking," not the subject, who should walk, but the predicate, how the walk is to be conducted; the two participles (here and ver. 3) do not then present secondary and additional thoughts. The passage is continued as though, in accordance with the sense, περιπατήσατε were to be read. So i. 18; Col. iii. 16; ii. 2, 10. WINER, p. 532. Ἀνεχόμενοι are those who endure the injuries and sins of others; ἀνοχή is the action of μακροθυμία, "long-suffering," which as the disposition, virtue, is to be perceived in the former. Comp. Rom. ii. 4; 2 Cor. xi. 1; 2 Thess. i. 4. Ἀνέχεσθαι is the active forbearance, ὑπομένειν the quiet endurance. TITTMANN, *Syn.* I. p. 194. The genitive ἀλλήλων, "one another," refers to the fact, that each one, who has to endure from another, gives occasion also for endurance; "long-suffering" is well aware of this.

In love, ἐν ἀγάπῃ.—This shows at once that the forbearance should not be mere coldness, indifference, obtuseness. Love should be the element of the endurance (iii. 18). *Aliorum infirmitates æquo animo ferimus, nec ob ea, quæ nobis in proximo displicent, ab ejus amicitia recedimus, sed* PERSONAM *constanter amamus, etsi vitia in odio habeamus* (CALOVIUS). Hence "in love" is not to be joined with what follows (OLSHAUSEN); nor are we besides this qualification of "forbearing," to take "with long-suffering," as still another such (CALVIN, RUECKERT, HARLESS, STIER and others); for the "forbearing" is the act of the "long-suffering," and the latter is not therefore the attendant (μετά) of the former, but its ground, its cause; a forbearing without love is conceivable and actually occurs, but never without long-suffering and yet in love, since love, according to its very nature, "suffereth long" (μακροθυμεῖ, 1 Cor. xiii. 4). Still less allowable is it to join the first μετά with ἀνεχόμενοι (BENGEL). [MEYER properly urges against this view that it makes an abrupt, instead of an easy, transition from the general: "walk worthy," to the special: "forbearing one another."—R.]

Ver. 3. **Earnestly striving to keep** [σπουδάζοντες τηρεῖν].—The participle is to be regarded grammatically like the preceding one. ["This clause is parallel to the preceding, and indicates not so much, as Meyer says, the inward feelings by which the ἀνέχεσθαι is to be characterized, as rather the motive to it, and the accompanying or simultaneous effort" (EADIE).—R.] It describes the zealous striving (LUTHER: be diligent), as Gal. ii. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 19. The present infinitive τηρεῖν denotes the continued maintenance which is necessary every day, since dangers constantly approach. The idea of the verb refers to retaining possession of property, which has not first to be gained. *Etiam ubi nulla fissura est, monitis opus est* (BENGEL).

The unity of the Spirit, τὴν ἑνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος, not τοῦ νοός, is the unity which the Holy Spirit effects. So CHRYSOSTOM: τὸ πνεῦμα τοὺς γένει καὶ τρόποις διαφόροις διεστηκότας ἑνοῖ, and most. It is not the unity peculiar to the Spirit, which needs not to be preserved by us (SCHENKEL), but the unity and concord of the Church and its members, and indeed only that which the Holy Ghost works; that accomplished by the spirit of the age is not the object of zealous preservation (τηρεῖν), but only of purification. [The genitive is that of the originating cause (EADIE, ELLICOTT) rather than a *possessive.* —The reference to the human spirit is altogether inadmissible, yet is advocated by ANSELM, ERASMUS, CALVIN, ESTIUS, RUECKERT, and others.—R.]

In the bond of peace, ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης.—This defines more closely the "keeping" which is the object of the "earnestly striving," and in the same way (ἐν) as in ver. 2 ("forbearing"—"in love"), since something depends upon the motive and mode of preserving unity. The very "unity," which is "of the Spirit," required and wrought by the Spirit, can be fostered, furthered and preserved in a carnal manner, from political and egotistical grounds. Against this our phrase is directed. Ὁσύνδεσμος, with the exception of Acts viii. 23, occurs only here and in the Epistle to the Colossians (ii. 19; iii. 14); to vers. 2, 3, Col. iii. 13, 14 are evident parallels. There "love" is "the bond of perfectness," hence a bond well adapted to preserve the unity of the Spirit. "Peace" is indeed itself a condition corresponding alike with "unity" and "love;" it is in spiritual life, and for the Church, first peace with God, and then that peace of heart which is undisturbed by the assaults, temptations and ills of the world and the flesh, not even by the disquiet of the conscience; and further with respect to our neighbor, it is peace with him in love to him, out of love to the Lord of the Church, the Saviour, to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and our Father, and to His children through Him. Hence love is the bond which cherishes peace in the Church, and in such love should that unity be preserved, which God's Spirit will work in the Church of Christ; "love edifieth" (1 Cor. viii. 1). Accordingly "the bond of peace" is love itself (so BENGEL). The genitive is, therefore, not epexegetical (BLEEK), nor the genitive of apposition (MEYER, SCHENKEL); else, as RUECKERT aptly remarks, the foundation of the building would be sustained by a perishable roof, the unity of the Spirit be preserved in or through peace with our neighbor, while the Apostle says, that the unity of the Spirit should be preserved in the efficient strength of the power, which fosters this very peace; that is love, which has peace through faith in love, and brings, establishes and retains peace. Where it is wanting, there is carnal nature and discord (1 Cor. iii. 3). Accordingly the preposition "in" designates love as the element in which the unity of the Spirit is to be maintained; hence ἐν is not=διά (BLEEK).

[Braune's view takes the genitive as *gen. objecti.* It is adopted by BENGEL, RUECKERT, HARLESS, STIER, following THEOPHYLACT. But it is open to serious objection. It is far from probable that the Apostle would express the notion "in love" by such a periphrasis, especially as the parallel clauses are not parallel in the *meaning* of their several parts. Certainly the Ephesians would not have the Colossian Epistle at hand to suggest to them this sense, and it is not at all obvious without that suggestion. The assumption that ἐν was instrumental may have led to this view of the phrase (MEYER). On the

other hand if the genitive be taken as one of apposition, defining the "bond" as "peace" (so FLATT, OLSHAUSEN, MEYER, EADIE, HODGE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT), we have an obvious and simple interpretation, suiting the sense of ἐν. RUECKERT's objection really applies only to the instrumental sense of the proposition. ALFORD: Peace binds together the Church as a condition and symbol of that inner unity which is only wrought by the indwelling Spirit of God.—Far more than the union of Jew and Gentile is meant. —R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Doctrine and Exhortation.* "The distinction of doctrinal and hortatory parts must not assume the unapostolical character of that modern fiction, according to which exhortation is so severed from doctrinal discussion, as to contain no doctrine at all. As little as an apostolic Epistle is a mere doctrinal discussion, so little is an apostolic, or even a Christian, exhortation without doctrine. What the Apostle requires, are not requirements *in addition to* and *outside of* doctrine, but *requirements of* doctrine, if by doctrine we mean the knowledge of Christian saving truth. This is the very order, which distinguishes Christian ethics from all other." The Apostle now shows his readers, "what the gospel *requires*, after he has called to their memories what it has given them. It requires manifestations of life from those who had been quickened, not from the dead. It expects works of love and righteousness from those who believe and are justified, from him who has been new-created unto good works (comp. on ii. 10). It expects good fruit from a good tree. The opinion that men can gather grapes of thorns, see works of holiness without faith, and make man just before God without the Redeemer; the preaching of morality and the theory of good works without faith, all constitute a perversion of Christian intelligence and of the apostolic order into the futility and confusion of pseudo-Christianity," (HARLESS). [The Apostle's "therefore" rebukes both the dogmatism of dead orthodoxy, and the cry: give us something practical, none of your dry doctrine. At one time the application to the former was more necessary, but the tendency of the present day calls for special attention to the other phase of the matter. When professing Christians or churches tire of the facts respecting God's love in Christ (the real Christian doctrine on which the Apostle's "therefore" rests), they have already ceased to be in earnest about the worthy walk.—R.]

2. *Paul's right to exhort.* The exhortation of the Apostle proceeds rather from the *Christian worthiness* of "the prisoner of the Lord," than from the *apostolic dignity* of the ambassador of the Lord; the latter is more the merely *outward*, the former more the inward authority, both belonging together; the latter could not exist without the former and *vice versa.* The former would have neither courage nor right without the latter, but the latter would lack fervency, sincerity and emphasis without the former. The most winning exordium as well as the most powerful Amen, is still the Christianity of the servant of Christ. *Vita clerici evangelium est populi. Non bene auditur, qui non bene diligitur* (GREGORY the Great). There should be no complaint, because at the present time so much is made to depend on the person, to this first of all men will look.

3. *The calling.* With the calling which God proffers to us, which we have experienced, the Christian life begins. At first we have only to hear (*hören*), then it comes about that we *hearken* (*zuhören*), and finally we *adhere* (*zugehören*). Many are the methods of the call: through God's word sung or spoken in the sanctuary, in the pictures of sacred art, in holy action, in the statements of pious Christians, or in the Scriptures as we read in the closet, from the mouth of a mother or a child, from events in the life of others or ourselves, in the voice of conscience and the immediate suggestion of the Spirit, suddenly, or in the way of gradual consideration, of recollection of what was previously learned and perhaps long-forgotten—thus often is the call addressed to each: every one is more than once, yes many times called by God to Himself. To this the walk should correspond, to this it should give testimony.

4. *The worthiness of the walk* is determined first and chiefly by the relation of him who is called to the revelation of grace which introduces and regulates the spiritually received, personal fellowship of grace with God. Thus the foundation of the Christian life is laid. In the received benefits and possession lies the germ of all the blessings of eternity. The great matter is constancy, fidelity, personal fidelity to the inwardly efficient word of God, to the personal fellowship with God wrought by the Holy Ghost who calls us, not to a precept, a law, rule, maxim, not even to one's own nature and soul; this comes in as a result of the first, which is the cause, the basis, the foundation work, followed by a superstructure of fidelity to the renewed soul.

5. *Lowliness* is the first attendant (μετά) of the Christian walk, beginning after the call of God: He who hears the call, recognizes Jesus as the Christ, feeling, He has more and is more, His heavenly and Divine fellowship is beyond all our experience, He knows and explains and presents the Father's will in overpowering clearness, strength and beauty, and thus he who is called ever feels himself to be more insignificant, sinful and needy. In listening to and looking unto Jesus, lowliness springs up within him; he became a Christian not having this, he did not need to bring it to Christianity or as a price for it, but by becoming a Christian he becomes humble, and that too in the most profound earnestness and lively sorrow over his own sin and poverty and weakness. The more the Christian knows and feels himself to be exalted as a child of God, as a member of the body whose Head is Christ, so much the more does he feel himself to be exalted without any desert or worthiness, only through the fellowship of grace with his Creator, Redeemer and Comforter. He rejoices in his peculiar gifts, but only as given, not as profitable or abused. He well knows, that he is of worth before God, but also that what he is and has is little in comparison with what he should and might be and have, that he is an unprofitable ser-

vant and yet is a child of God, a joint heir with Christ.

6. *Meekness* is joined with lowliness. This is not a soft, yielding natural disposition, nor a prudent bridling of a passionate nature, but it is humility applied to the world, not taking offence at the offences of the world, even though misunderstood, mercilessly treated, oppressed and persecuted. This does not estrange her, for she knows herself. The knowledge and experience of corruption and of salvation through Christ in our own heart, produces either no permanent feeling, or else a common feeling, a fellow-feeling, which looks upon him who gives or prepares offence, as one who is suffering under sin, as unfortunate, rather than as evil-minded and rejoicing in sin; accordingly she remains without bitterness, because she has herself experienced the rich grace of God, and perseveres in patience, because she knows God's patience. [It is also exercised toward God, in submission, which is the foundation of its manifestations toward men. —R.]

7. *Long-suffering* is added as an especial attendant of the Christian walk in social life. It is meekness towards the sins of others, whom we can punish, meekness, keeping its ground against a long series of these. She knows out of her own experience of the long-suffering of God, that sin is misery, out of which condemning and judging never helps us, but rather grace and mercy, if one will let himself be helped. Long-suffering refrains from punishment, that rejects, cuts off, expels from fellowship and friendship, having instead entreaty, exhortation, instruction, discipline in word and deed. She can lovingly hope, is lovingly spirited and brave. She bears with her neighbor, does not weakly yield, does not stand by coldly and stolidly, nor yet embittered and in carnal anger; she is not whimpering and feeble, but strong and heroic in her love, like a mother or a friend.

8. *Unity* should be the object of zealous striving, but only that unity which the Holy Ghost works. It is not first to be made, is not factitious, but unity, wrought from above, which we have only to preserve. Over against this, the Christian must keep at a distance from all party combinations, which in effect introduce discord and schism into church-life. But he must also avoid jumbling together the great variety and wealth of gifts and powers, and seeking to unite all under external form and letter. No carnal strife, but also no slothful peace, no patched-up, hypocritical or dead unity.

9. *The impulse* under which we must endeavor to keep this peace, is *peaceable love*, which can have foes, but is a foe to none, rejoicing in every gift and creature of God, embracing such and leading them into the life of the church, employing and enjoying them, as a nation in time of peace with its various classes, labors and powers, strives in every direction to perform its task, not from the motions of the flesh, but from the basis which God has given, out towards the appointed goal.

10. Paul conceives of the Church of Christ above all as a living company of Christian persons, not as an institution with all its regulations. But the sacredness does not rest upon the individuals, but inheres in the whole organism, which the Holy Ghost animates.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Suffer as a Christian, in order to be able to work in the service of the Master.—Show thyself in deed a servant of Christ, in order in such service to be able to direct aright in word, those who are directed to thee.—Loosen doctrine from the precept which it contains, but do not sever them from one another; distinguish, but do not divide them. There is no Christianity without Christ, and no religion without morality, but at the same time those ethics are of no value which have no doctrine behind them. True the conscience is the *voice* of God, but what were that, if it were without the Word of God?—He who walks unworthy of his vocation is doubly culpable, more than a heathen; do not despise the calling.—As a child of man, a son of earth, no one stands alone and solitary, but with others, as child of God also dost thou belong to a family; take heed thereto! Thou belongest not merely to the visible, but also to the invisible church.—The three chief virtues of a Christian: Lowliness, meekness, and long-suffering [*Demuth*, *Sanftmuth*, *Langmuth*].—Humility is the basis of all Christian virtue; without it all is wicked, however praiseworthy it may otherwise appear. It is nothing more than evangelical truth applied to all cases; a doctrine which does not make us humble is of no account.—Christian practice in walk and conversation is indispensable; it is more important to be skilful in this, than to have special insight respecting the theory.

Starke:—Christians have a great and important calling, to walk worthily according to the commands of their Saviour. O that we ever had this calling before our eyes in all our doings!—Where there is much cross, there much light is. Tribulation brings experience; he preaches best who preaches out of his experience.—What God gives and how He gives should satisfy us. Bread and honor are the twin-portions of our calling.—He lives in no shame, who has an unpleasant calling, for God has set him in it. Has God ordained, our pleasure's gained!—Without lowliness, gentleness and patience the unity of the Spirit cannot be maintained. All discord, heresy and schism come from the vices which are opposed to these virtues.—A gentle spirit is the garden in which patience grows.—Unity of the Spirit, the highest ornament of Christians. How? should those live in discord, who are members of one body, of one Head, Jesus Christ? But that is the very sign of a corrupted Christianity, that there are so many sects, so much discord and strife among Christians.

Rieger:—Paul has just prayed so heartily, now he can exhort so profitably. Have you never found that after secret intercourse with God in prayer, your neighbor's heart also inclines more to you, and is more willing to receive a word which is redolent of prayer?—The call entitles us indeed to the kingdom and glory of God, but it obligates us also to sanctification, and to adorn the doctrine of God and our Saviour.—*Humility* stands in the feeling of her own defects, and knows how slowly the growth of the

inner man proceeds; hence in *meekness* she does not exact too much of others, and in *long-suffering* does not lose patience, when an enduring love is necessary in meeting others. *Endurance* is keenly felt, but love sweetens it, as we see in the case of our children, what we can endure in them, in order in love to help them out of their infirmities. *Endeavor* overcomes all difficulties: only ever revert to confidence in God.—Unity in the Spirit we dare not make, but only keep it.—To maintain peace is better than to maintain right.

HEUBNER:—The Christian should be and remain conscious of the fellowship to which he belongs: it is a calamity in the Christian church, that this consciousness has been so greatly extinguished. This consciousness should not be maintained proudly but humbly, because the higher the aim, the greater the required perfection, so much the more should each one be conscious of his distance from it and his weakness. The principle of the Christian communion is: to humble ourselves, to become the least, to serve; out of this grows meekness, which shows itself towards those who make the fulfilment of the duty difficult for us.—*Endurance* presupposes, that every one has something that is obnoxious to others. It is necessary, because we ourselves are troublesome to others, and because we are all members of one body, and because it is God who places others by our side.—The unity in the Spirit is something very different from corporate, external, conventional, superficial unity; it dwells deep within, in the entire will and disposition, it is holy, proceeding from the Spirit, not from mere prudence, concerning itself about essentials, not about non-essentials. From this we infer what real union is; the Spirit alone can create it, that made by man is as a rule of no value.—SPANGENBERG says: "I hold that no one is a child of God merely because he belongs to this or that religion [*i. e.*, Christian confession]; to him who receives Jesus Christ, power will be given to become a son of God. In Christ Jesus nothing avails save faith, which works by love. He in whom I find this faith is my brother. Is he of another religion, that makes no difference, he is still my brother and nearer to me than my fellow-professors who have no faith. Indeed, because he is of another religion, in which the gospel does not shine so brightly, he is to me a miracle of grace."—The Moravians have been very unjustly accused of narrow-heartedness.

PASSAVANT:—*The calling of men* was from the beginning, to live innocently and holily, thankfully and obediently toward their God. *The calling of the sinner* is: to repent, to forsake the ways of sin, to seek pardon, grace and peace; to turn to the holy and living God, whom he has long forsaken. *The calling of the Christian* is this: internally and externally, with word and work, with his whole life, in all things, at all times in the church, before believers and unbelievers, to give glory to God the Father in Jesus Christ.—One may endure the faults of his neighbor from want of feeling, from mildness of temperament, from human good-nature, from earthly politeness, from temporal policy, from pharisaical hypocrisy; nothing is so common; but it is rarely done out of real Christian love.

STIER:—What is not rooted in humility does not deserve the name of a virtue.—Always and everywhere this alone is of avail, to cherish the unity of *the Spirit;* thus out of every desolation a new edifice is formed, without this the most beautiful structure becomes rotten and finally breaks.

GERLACH:—Patience manifests itself in the quiet endurance of injuries, long-suffering, more in the active maintenance of others in necessities, even when criminal.

SERMONS *on the Epistle for the 17th Sunday after Trinity* (iv. 1-6). WESTERMEIER: *Unity in the Spirit:* 1. What is it? 2. By what means is it preserved? *a*) in general (ver. 1); *b*) in particular (vers. 2, 3); 3. On what grounds should it be maintained (vers. 4-6).

ZIEL:—Endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit! 1. On what this admonition is based (vers. 4-6). 2. How we obey it (vers. 1-3).

AHLFELD:—*Walk worthy of your Christian calling!* 1) Your calling as children of God; 2) your calling as brethren to each other; 3) your calling, to derive the power for such a walk from the right sources.—*Our joy in the congregation of the saints.* 1) Who are these saints and how far does this fellowship extend? 2) What is the bond which encircles them? 3) What blessing and what joy do we derive from this fellowship of the saints?

RAUTENBERG:—*The unity of the children of God.* 1) How the Divine call requires it; 2) in what it consists; 3) from what it proceeds; 4) to what it obliges every one.

KAPFF:—Endeavor to keep the unity in the Spirit! 1. Let go what disturbs unity. 2. Hold fast what confirms it.

HEUBNER:—*The unity of the Christian Church.* 1. Oneness of life: *a*) Worthy walk, *b*) brotherly love, *c*) peaceableness. 2. Oneness of faith: *a*) in *one* Holy Ghost, *b*) in *one* Saviour, *c*) in *one* God and Father.—*The duties of Christian church-membership.* 1. A walk which is worthy of the call into the church (ver. 1). 2. Specially fraternal walk in humility and love (ver. 2). 3. A concordant, harmonious walk, not mere external but internal unity (ver. 3), for the fellowship of the Church is not merely a body, but a Spirit (ver. 4); it is founded upon one faith in Christ and *one* confession (ver. 3) and is perfected in God the Father.—*The communion of the saints.* 1. A description: not of a place, nor of a form, but of love and of faith. 2. How is it established: not by force, by human power or act, but by the Spirit of God. 3. Its importance. *The equality of our fellowship in Christianity.* 1. Proof: we have *one* calling, one Saviour, one Father. 2. Application: Thanksgiving to God, caution against pride, consolation for the lowly and poor, awakening endeavors after this fellowship.

PRÖHLE:—Endeavor to keep the unity in the Spirit! 1. Only in sorrow can we receive this exhortation now-a-days. 2. May it knock loudly upon the conscience of every one. 3. And may it bind anew in firm union our hearts and hands. —Forbearing one another in love. 1. *Meaning:* *a*) We should follow after peace, as husbands, wives, kinsmen, masters, servants. *b*) This is possible through lowliness, meekness, long-suffering. 2. *Motive:* *a*) The duty of brotherly love, *b*) our own defects; to-day I must bear with you, to-morrow you must bear with me.

2. Three motives to the preservation of the unity in the Spirit.

CHAP. IV. 4–16.

a. The working of the Triune God in the Church.

(CHAP. IV. 4–6.)

4 *There is* one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called [as ye were also called]
5, 6 in one hope of your calling; One Lord, one faith, one baptism, One God and
Father of all, who *is* above [over] all, and through all, and in you all [in all].

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

1 Ver. 6.—[The *Rec.* inserts ὑμῖν (with very slight authority), while D. F. K. L., good versions and a few fathers, 40 cursives, read ἡμῖν; no pronoun occurs in ℵ. A. B. C., 10 cursives. Most fathers also sustain the omission, which is accepted by nearly all editors and commentators since Lachmann, the pronouns being regarded as exegetical glosses to confine the assertion to Christians.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Connection.—These three verses are joined to what precedes without any connecting particle, and, as parallel clauses, follow each other without any such particle, since the context, being quite clear, requires none. THEODORET: πανταχοῦ τὸ ἓν καὶ εἰς τέθεικειεν εἰς συμφωνίαν συνάπτων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. BUGENHAGEN: *omnia, unde Christiani sumus, unitate nobis commendantur.* The exhortation to maintain the unity of the Spirit has mainly occasioned these verses; they give a reason for it; γάρ is wanting however, on account of the liveliness of the discourse, and for emphasis.* The *objective bases* for unity in the Spirit, to which they have been exhorted, the motives for such exhortation are stated.† Hence we should supply ἐστίν, and not ἐστέ, as though it were continued exhortation (*Syriac*, CALVIN, HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 127, and others). [Braune's view is that generally received, and by far the most tenable.—R.]

Ver. 4. *The nature of the fellowship.*—**There is one body and one Spirit** [ἓν σῶμα καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα].—Ἓν σῶμα (i. 23; ii. 16; Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 13, 20) designates the totality of Christians as a *corpus mysticum;* it is not=ἐκκλησιά, *church*, which is to be viewed as the external *phenomenon*, the *body* of Christ is hidden, but a reality, like the body of nerves, a hidden reality, which can be traced, making itself perceptible, the invisible church, the unity of which is emphasized by the Apostle and to be held fast.—Καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα is added to designate the soul of this body, the Holy Ghost, which forms and moulds the body, and to show that this σῶμα of Christ is no πτῶμα. He is not speaking therefore of an ideal invisible church, which does not actually exist, but of the actual, real essence of the church, which is internal, but comes into being continuously. It is foolish to explain here, we should be united *penitus, corpore et anima, non ex parte duntaxat* (CALVIN and others).

Since Christ's body and the Holy Ghost are perceptible, not in their essence, but only inwardly and in their effects and consequences, Paul refers next to their own experience:

As ye were also called in one hope of your calling [καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν].—According to the calling (καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθητε), by means of which he who is called has obtained or can obtain knowledge and perception of the "body" and "Spirit" just mentioned! This calling points likewise (καί) to the unity, because it is consummated "in one hope;" as soon as a man is called of God, he is in the hope of salvation (σωτηρία, κληρονομία) and this hope is one and the same for each and all who are called, by right, in tendency and effect. This "hope" belongs so especially to the being called (ἐκλήθητε) that it can be termed all along "of your calling;" hope and calling are not to be separated from each other. BENGEL is excellent: *Spiritus est* ARRHABO, *atque ideo cum ejus mentione conjungitur* SPES HEREDITATIS. They belong together from the beginning; Paul here however refers to the history of the origin of church-fellowship which is to be maintained, whether one looks at the unity of the church, or of principle, or of aim. It cannot be said that the calling consists *in hope* (BENGEL: ἐν *exprimit indolem rei*, HARLESS and others), still less that it takes place *by means* of hope (MEYER), or that ἐν is=εἰς. WINER, p. 385.

[See EADIE for a list of prepositions used with καλέω in the New Testament. He, with ALFORD

* [So EADIE with more correctness than ALFORD and ELLICOTT, for though γάρ is not to be supplied, yet the logical connection of the assertion is argumentative. It is one of the rare cases where the grammatical nicety of the commentator last named has led him somewhat astray.—R.]

† [So MEYER: "Objective relations of unity, to which the non-observance of the precept in ver. 3 would be opposed. These are: 1. *The Church itself constituted as a unity*—one body, one Spirit, one blessed consummation, ver. 4; 2. *That by which this constitution of the same as a unity has and does come to pass*—one Lord, one faith, one baptism, ver. 5; 3. *The supreme Ruler, Administrator and Preserver of this entire unity*—one God and Father, etc., ver. 6. Notice the triple tri-partite division."—R.]

and ELLICOTT, rightly supports the usual meaning of ἐν here: the element in which the calling took place. ELLICOTT speaks of this sense of the preposition as being, "so to say, its theological meaning." He takes the genitive as one of originating cause, but it is rather that of possession, "the genitive of the correlative noun, suggesting what belongs to the call and characterized it, when they received it. The 'hope' is 'one,' for it has one object, and that is glory; one fountain, and that is Christ" (EADIE). Ἐλπίς is of course subjective.—R.]

Ver. 5. *Christ and the union with Him.*—**One Lord, one faith, one baptism.**—This refers to the way and the means of salvation. Εἷς κύριος, "one Lord," is Christ, the Lord *par excellence.* See ver. 1; i. 21. The word found in Deut. vi. 4 is now applied in the New Testament to Christ (1 Cor. viii. 4-6). His will has authority over all. Each one stands equally near to Him; for there is "one faith," which unites with Him; faith (i. 1, 15; ii. 8; iii. 12, 17) unites inwardly to the one Lord, trusts Him as Lord. Hence there is but **one faith**, and not several kinds: *fides, qua creditur;* it is not then a faith *in abstracto* (HARLESS), nor the doctrine of faith (GROTIUS and others); for this faith is actually and efficiently present and a living power, a believing. [A vast deal of difficulty as well as of error is avoided by bearing in mind that πίστις, "faith," in the New Testament, almost invariably means *subjective* faith (Gal. i. 23 is the only exception, and this perhaps an apparent one). The conception of "faith" as a universal dogma belongs to a later age, and while it has preserved Roman Catholic uniformity, has not "kept the unity of the Spirit." So the Apostle implies: Because there is one faith, keep unity, not because we need unity, lay down one objective Catholic undoubted Christian faith. Dr. HODGE defends the objective sense here, but must make limitations which are of necessity indefinite enough to cast doubt on his own view. Still the context plainly points to the "one Lord" as the object of the "one faith;" and in the nature of things one subjective recognition of this eternal truth respecting Christ, this apprehension of Him in His Person and work, necessarily involves a common objective profession of it, and thus we pass to the third term of the verse, which is to be regarded as the external sign of faith, and in one aspect as a profession objectively made. —R.]

Faith, which is one, begins with baptism, which is also only one; the former is an internal subjective medium, the latter an objective one, from without and above; these two factors make the Lord our own, and us the Lord's own. *Modo baptismus modo fides præponitur,* Mark xvi. 16; Col. ii. 12 (BENGEL). [The order of the words does not justify this view of Dr. Braune's. ALFORD takes the verse as presenting three great facts on which unity rests, the first objective, the second subjective, the third compounded of the two: "the objective seal of the subjective faith, by which, as a badge, the members of Christ are outwardly and visibly stamped with His name." To find a reference to one *mode* of baptism is unwarranted by text or context.—R.]

Why the Lord's Supper is not mentioned, is evident from the context, which contains the motives for the exhortation, to *desire* to preserve the unity of the Spirit. The Lord's Supper is rather an act of the preserved unity, than a motive for its preservation. It is celebrated by those who have been reconciled with God and hold each other to be brethren; it does not so much give an impulse to peaceableness, as it is a result of the same, as a common celebration of those who have become united together, as an attestation of the church which has become one in the Lord. DE WETTE refers to this by intimating that the Lord's Supper is not mentioned, because it is a *representation of unity.** The reference to the fundamental conditions of the Christian communion at its beginning is an insufficient ground for the omission of this sacrament (HARLESS and others). Still less admissible is it to suppose that it is included in the one sacrament of baptism (CALOVIUS), or in the "one Lord, one faith" (OLSHAUSEN), or to explain historically, that there has been as yet no separate celebration (MEYER), or that this is prophetic foresight, since the unity of the sacred feast would be broken nevertheless (STIER), or because he did not wish to hinder the manifold form of the rite (SCHENKEL), or because a definite expression for it was wanting (BLEEK).

Ver. 6. *The deepest basis of true unity.* **One God and Father of all.**—Here God the Father is referred to, after the Spirit (ver. 4) and the Son (ver. 5) have been made prominent. As little as God can be disunited with Himself, so little should you who are His children be among yourselves. Hence to the phrase "one God," there is added epexegetically: "and Father," the genitive "of all," under which Christ cannot be included, leading us to understand it as the Father of believers, of those who have become God's children in Christ. "Father" cannot then mean merely "creator," according to the heathen conception, nor can "of all" be neuter in this context. *Nam omnes ad unitatem rediguntur* (BENGEL), and the following "all" (πάντων πᾶσι) takes up the first one again, referring to persons, to the members of the Church, who should preserve the unity in the Spirit; on which account ver. 7 continues: "to every one of you." It is accordingly neither neuter (IRENÆUS and others), nor to be extended to men in general (HOLZHAUSEN).

Who is over all, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων, marks the Ruler, Guardian, Guide (WINER, p. 351) governing over all (WINER, p. 390). CHRYSOSTOM: ἐπάνω πάντων, τὴν δεσποτείαν σημαίνει.

And through all, καὶ διὰ πάντων, *per omnes operans* (BENGEL); the individuals are instruments, means, as Rom. xv. 18; 1 Cor. iii. 9; Gal. i. 1: δι' ἀνθρώπου—διά Ἰησοῦ. See WINER, p. 390.

And in all, καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν, dwelling in all

*[On this question, which seems to have occupied undue prominence from the sacramental tendencies of many commentators, ELLICOTT remarks that if a reason must be assigned, "it must be referred to the fundamental difference between the sacraments. The one is rather the symbol of *union,* the other, from its single celebration and marked individual reference, presents more clearly the idea of *unity,*—the idea most in harmony with the context."—R.]

(BENGEL, WINER), filling them, perfecting them (John xiv. 23). All three qualifications refer to "God and Father," hence are not to be interpreted in a trinitarian sense, of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, so that He who is "through all" is the Head working through all, and He who is "in all" is the indwelling Spirit, yet such a reference lies unmistakably in the background (Rom. xi. 36; 1 Cor. xii. 4-6; 2 Cor. xiii. 13), at all events was not far off, so that HARLESS can discover here a recapitulation of "one God," "one Lord," "one Spirit," which STIER and others think was intentional. Comp. HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, I. p. 201 f., who doubts any reference to the Trinity, but applying it to the Father not without the Son and the Spirit, excludes no one Person. The reference to Redemption alone is clearer, hence "through all" is not to be understood of the all-pervading creative power, nor of Providence in general.

[While the mention of "one baptism," with its Trinitarian formula, suggests the great probability of a reference to the Trinity in the several expressions of this verse, which is further favored by the first and third prepositions, it is far safer not to press it. The express mention of the "Father" is against it; *διά* can be referred to the work or office of the Son only by departing from its proper sense or inverting its relation to the rest of the verse ("*per quem omnia facta sunt*," AQUINAS, so OLSHAUSEN), and as EADIE remarks: "In previous portions of the Epistle triune relation has been distinctly brought out; here the representation is different, for unity is the idea dwelt on, and it is the One God and Father Himself who works through all and dwells in all." ELLICOTT here confessedly allows doctrinal considerations to outweigh his exegetical convictions, and it is precisely thus, that those who defend the well-grounded doctrine of the church lose in their contests with those who impugn it. They attack our exegesis of a passage like this, and we must defend the doubtful, unimportant outpost at a disadvantage.—One thing is certain that this passage refers to believers alone, neither teaching God's Fatherhship of all men (though ALFORD thinks it is referred to as a lost possession), nor pantheism of any kind.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The unity of the Church.* Although *ἐκκλησία* and *σῶμα* (*Χριστοῦ*) describe so nearly the same, that of the former it is said (i. 23): "which is his body," while in Col. i. 24 we read of "his body, which is the church," yet the two may be thus distinguished: the former designates the church as an assembly of believers, of saints; the latter as a living organism, the organ of Him who is the Head, thus with the *corpus Christi mysticum*, giving more prominence to the inner concealed side, the unity of the same. Hence there are indeed "churches," but no "*bodies* of Christ." The Nicene creed was right in adding: UNAM to *sanctam catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam* (the Apostles' has only: *sanctam ecclesiam catholicam*); so the Augsburg Confession, Art. 7: *quod* UNA *sancta ecclesia perpetuo mansura sit.* Strictly there is but *one* Church of Christ, though in groups of congregations with different confessions. No confessional church (though, strictly speaking, the term is a misnomer) is *the* Church of Christ, it is only *a* church by the side of others, through which the body of Christ extends itself.

2. *The distinction of the body of Christ from the Spirit* is indicated definitely enough by their being placed side by side, yet the latter at the same time gives prominence to the church as the working-place of the Spirit.*

3. *The call*, when accepted and effectual, begins within the called, not with a mere promise which he receives, but with a *hope* corresponding thereto, so that the objective call of God and the subjective acceptance of the man come together, and he from the very beginning knows and feels himself to be shown out of the lower sphere of life into the higher one.

4. *Christ is the One Lord*, and no faith in Him is genuine, except it be in Him as Lord. It is not sufficient to believe the Master or Teacher; it is not enough to feel and deem ourselves scholars, hearers, disciples. The Christian must be servant, subject of Christ, not merely to hear or listen to Him, but to belong to Him, to hearken to Him, to obey, to follow Him as His vassal, attendant, servant. No human dignity, in the history of our lives or of the world exceeds the dignity of Christ: He is the one only Lord; who gives Him up, must give up faith and the fellowship of the church.

5. *Baptism*, with which faith begins (*regeneratio præcedit fidem*) imparts the germ of the new life, the beginning of the gift of the Holy Ghost, the principle of faith in the subject, as at birth, upon coming to the light of the world, man is endowed with reason. It is not merely a symbolical act, nor a mere prophecy of the cleansing which begins later, but it is the incorporation into the body of Christ, animated by the Spirit, implantation into the soil of divine life. [This is the Lutheran view, approaching, in its estimate of the objective grace of this Sacrament, the position of Romanism and Anglicanism. Certainly the fact that baptism is mentioned at all, puts it into an exalted position, from which unchurchly Zwinglianism would degrade it. But it is not placed before faith, nor is there here any warrant for the assertion that faith begins with baptism. The Reformed or Calvinistic view is most in accordance with our passage. See *Heidelberg Catechism*, Questions 69-74; *Belgic Confession*, xxxiv.; *Westminster Confession*, xxviii.; comp. especially *Romans*, p. 206, *Doct. Note* 3.—While there is no reference to the one mode of baptism, there is probably an allusion to the fact that baptism is not or should not be repeated. —R.]

* [HODGE: "There are many passages to which the doctrine of the Trinity gives a sacred rhythm, though the doctrine itself is not directly asserted. It is so here. There is one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father. The unity of the Church is founded on this doctrine. It is one, because there is to us one God the Father, one Lord, one Spirit. It is a truly mystical union; not a mere union of opinion, of interest, or of feeling; but something supernatural arising from a common principle of life. This life is not the natural life which belongs to us as creatures; nor intellectual, which belongs to us as rational beings; but it is spiritual life, called elsewhere the life of God in the soul. And as this life is common on the one hand to Christ and all His members, and on the other to Christ and God, this union of the Church is not only with Christ, but with the Triune God."—R.]

6. *God, the Father of believers*, is not far from them, over them, but near to them, disposing concerning them, working through them, yes, dwelling in them, as in a temple, furnishing His work as in a work-shop. God is a *Person*, who not only rules throughout the universe, but gives to His own a special personality.

7. The *Atheist* denies the Father, the *Deist* the Son, the Pantheist the Holy Ghost, because he substitutes for it the unholy "spirit of the world" (BAADER).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ever return from multiplicity to unity, and in freedom to obligation; but never let your view of the *unities* be disturbed. Do not hold faith higher than baptism, penetrate into the communion of the Church until you reach the Spirit which is its soul, and do not sunder the Lord Jesus and God the Father!

STARKE:—There is but one Church, which receives life and movement from the Holy Ghost, and hence but one ship, with which we can sail into the haven of bliss; all other vessels destroy and drown.—Christians are all equal in the fellowship of heavenly possessions, and no one has a better God, Christ, Spirit, Faith, *etc.*, but what one has, the others have also, although one may have a greater enjoyment of such possessions than another.

RIEGER:—The body of Christ is ruled by one Spirit; one Lord gave Himself for the Redemption of all; out of one Word of truth and of faith are we convinced; one baptism is the door of entrance for us into the kingdom of God. Therefore God administers such a government of love over all, that as much as possible equality is established; out of his property every one can contribute something to the common benefit: as God on the other hand so gives Himself to be enjoyed by each, that he dare not look too anxiously upon others, still less through secret envy render difficult his keeping peace with all.—HEUBNER, see *Homil. Notes* on the preceding section.

PASSAVANT:—There is one path, one goal, one house, one family, one home to which you have been called; you all hope for one heaven, and in the same heaven to obtain a common inheritance, an identical blessedness and glory in the heavenly life.—"I do not know, how it happens, that we glory in being the children of God so confidently and yet at the same time forget brotherly love."

STIER:—Where there is still body, there is also Spirit—that is the Apostle's great thought.—Baptism and Faith belong together: 1. As faith is the subjective appropriation, so baptism is the objective representation of the same; 2. Faith takes out of the Lord's hand, in baptism we have the firm foundation and beginning from the Lord.—I confess that I find the one faith on the Lord in many a [Roman] Catholic with the hearty joy of fraternal agreement, and in many a zealot for the pure Word and Sacrament I might look for it with pain and in vain.

[EADIE:—"One baptism" is the result and expression of the "one faith" in the "one Lord," and, at the same time, the one mode of initiation by the "one Spirit" into the "one body."—All this unity is but the impress of the great primal unity—one God.—Christ's claim for the preservation of unity is upon all the churches—a unity of present connection and actual enjoyment—not a truce, but an alliance, with one living and cognizance—not a compromise, but a veritable incorporation.—HODGE:—All sins against unity are sins against the Holy Ghost.—R.]

[Seven times does the word "one" occur in these verses, but the middle term is "one Lord," next on either side "one hope"—"one faith."—How great a unity results from "one faith," the same trust of the heart on the "one Lord;" one creed often leads and always permits us to chop logic and split hairs, but where the "faith" is "one," hearts are one, and no earnest Christian has failed to notice how quickly this manifests itself.—It is a comfort to come back from the jars of the church of to-day and the wars of the church of the past, to the simple truth: There is one body: but here too faith is required.—R.]

---

b. The gift of Christ to individuals.

(CHAP. IV. 7–10).

7 But unto every [to each] one of us is given grace [was the[1] grace given] accord-
8 ing to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith, When he ascended
9 up on high, he led [a] captivity captive, and[2] gave gifts unto [to] men. ([*omit*
parenthesis] Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first [*omit*
10 first][3] into the lower parts[4] of the earth? He that [who] descended is the same
also that [he it is also who] ascended up far [*omit* far] above all [the] heavens,
that he might fill all things.) [*omit*)].

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 7.—[The article is omitted in B. D.[1] F. G. L., a few cursives, by Lachmann; bracketted by Alford; inserted in א. A. C. D.[3] K., accepted by Tischendorf and most recent editors. The omission was probably due to the η which precedes, and some glosses still further sustain its genuineness.—The order of the E. V. is altered for the sake of retaining the article, and *was* substituted for *is*, to bring out the force of the aorist.—R.]

[2] Ver. 8.—[Καί is omitted in א. A. C.[2] D.[1] F., versions and fathers; rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf (ed. 2), Ellicott. It is found in (*Rec.*) א.[3] B. C.[1 3] D.[3] K. L., nearly all cursives, versions (*Syriac*, etc.), fathers; accepted by Tischendorf (ed. 7), Meyer, Alford, Braune. As it is wanting in the LXX., the internal evidence seems to decide in its favor; an insertion for the sake of connection is not probable.—See *Exeg. Notes* for the text of the original Hebrew and the LXX.—R.]

[3] Ver. 9.—[The *Rec.* inserts πρῶτον, on the authority of א.[3] B. C.[3] K. L., cursives, versions and fathers; it is not found in א. A. C. D.[1] F., and is rejected by modern editors as an explanatory gloss.—R.]

[4] Ver. 9.—[The authority for μέρη is much stronger than for πρῶτον (א. A. B. C. D.[3] K. L., nearly all cursives, a few versions and fathers), though it is open to suspicion as an explanatory gloss, and is rejected by Tischendorf, Meyer and Ellicott (omitted in D.[1] F., most fathers). It is however retained, on account of the strong uncial support, by Lachmann, Scholz, Rückert, Alford and Braune.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 7. *Every one is cared for by Christ.*—**But to each one of us**, ἑνὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ ἡμῶν.—Antithetical to "through all and in all," in order to explain it and to give prominence to the subjective condition, which is a motive for the preservation of unity; "of us" holds fast to the circle of Christians, of believers; it recalls iii. 20: "in us." After the seventh "one" and the fourth "all," prominence is given to the specializing of what is common to all, to what is peculiar to the individuals. [Hence ἑνὶ in addition to ἑκάστῳ.—R.] It cannot be referred to teachers (PASSAVANT), or to extraordinary Christians (BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS), or to the relation of Jewish and Gentile Christians (OLSHAUSEN). Each has a part in salvation, and should prove it in concord; each has a part in salvation, and hence should be treated in a fraternal manner.

Was the grace given [ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις].—The verb stands first for emphasis: Every one has *received*, no one has it of himself; each has to recognize that, for himself, in order not to be proud, for another, in order not to despise or avoid him. That which was given by Christ is "the grace," God's grace, which is active and noticeable in Christianity,* and of which he has already spoken in ver. 6 (HARLESS); or the grace imparted

According to the measure of the gift of Christ [κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ].—One kind of grace is given, and yet very differently. It is given by Christ; hence the genitive Χριστοῦ is the genitive *subjecti*, on which account we find in ver. 8: "and gave gifts," ver. 11: "and He gave," accordingly that gift which He has given, not received (OEDER in Wolf). He gives to each individual, to one more, to another less, to each the entire grace, but in peculiar form, with differently manifested strength, efficacy and tendency; hence "according to the measure of the gift of Christ." ["In proportion to the amount of the gift which Christ gives" (ELLICOTT), the first genitive being a simple possessive genitive, and the second that of the agent, or both being subjective. STIER tries to combine the ideas of giving and receiving in the phrase: "of Christ." "The rule is not our merit, or our previous capacity, nor our asking, but His own good pleasure" (HODGE).—R.]

* [The aorist points to a definite act: "by Christ, at the time of His exaltation—when He bestowed gifts on men" (Alford).—"The grace," as the article is to be retained, has some shade of a transitive force, denoting the energizing grace which manifests itself in the peculiar gift (ELLICOTT) rather than the spiritual gift itself and the influence, function, or office flowing from it (HODGE).—R.]

Christ has power thereto; Vers. 8–10. *a*) The *quotation* (ver. 8). *b*) *The further exposition and application* (vers. 9, 10).

Ver. 8. **Wherefore he saith.**—Διό denotes that in the quotation there is a reference and proof, *i. e.*, for "the gift of Christ;" as will appear. We most naturally supply ἡ γραφή, the Scripture, with λέγει, "saith" (Jas. iv. 6; Rom. xv. 10; Gal. iii. 16; 1 Cor. vi. 16: φησίν), and not ὁ θεός (MEYER, SCHENKEL), or ὁ λέγων (BLEEK: the writer). [The fact that Paul frequently supplies ἡ γραφή (Rom. iv. 3; ix. 17; x. 11; Gal. iv. 30; 1 Tim. v. 18) is against Braune's view; for in some of these passages there is a reason for its insertion (see *Romans*, p. 314), and as the Scriptures are God's Word (MEYER), the natural aim and obvious subject is ὁ θεός. So ALFORD, ELLICOTT and most.—R.] The quotation is from Psalm lxviii. 19: עָלִיתָ לַמָּרוֹם שָׁבִיתָ שֶּׁבִי לָקַחְתָּ מַתָּנוֹת בָּאָדָם: LXX.: ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ᾐχμαλώτευσας αἰχμαλωσίαν ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ. In Paul it reads:

When he ascended upon high he led a captivity captive, and gave gifts to men, ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ᾐχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν καὶ ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.—The citation is unmistakable up to the last clause: Paul has used the third person instead of the second, because he would mark the application and not merely quote; but in the last clause he substitutes "give" for "receive," and the dative τοῖς ἀνθρώποις for ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ. The article is found in the Hebrew, in the Kamets, and in the singular, the general idea, which Paul expresses by the plural, inheres. Accordingly there remains but three variations of any consequence: לקח, λαμβάνειν, *to receive*, what is in itself inadmissible, δίδοναι, *to give;* instead of באדם, the dative, which is not represented by בְּ, but by לְ, and the added καί. What in the glorious Psalm is said of God, whose triumphant doings on the earth are praised, and who takes up His abode on Mount Zion, in His sanctuary, to which the people festively draw near, and whither the Gentiles also will come, this the Apostle here applies to Christ. David sang of the ark of the covenant, which, after a great victory, was transferred (STIER) or brought back (HENGSTEN-

BERG) to Zion. In this fact he sees the principle of the history of the Kingdom of God, appearing in ever widening circles and nobler manner; the fact is to him a type of the method and course of the Messianic kingdom. Hence the general view (vers. 2-7 and 29-36) and the reminiscence of the journey through the wilderness from Sinai to Zion (vers. 8-19). So that the Apostle is perfectly justified in finding the singer's eye directed towards Christ and thus interpreting it. The *height* ("on high") in the Psalm is first of all *Zion* (ver. 16, 17; comp. Jer. xvii. 12, 23; xxxi. 12; xxxiv. 14, where מָרוֹם is spoken of Zion); but this is a type of heaven; of the most holy height, on which account the Apostle has heaven in his mind (ver. 10).* By "captivity," *αἰχμαλωσία*, according to Judith ii. 9; Ezra vi. 5; Rev. xiii. 10, we must understand captives, a troop or group of them, and not prison, captivity (LUTHER). This the parallelism which follows in the Psalm (LXX.: *ἀπειθοῦντες*, Vulgate: *non credentes*) teaches us; indeed the next clause (*ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ*) indicates plainly enough that the notion of *αἰχμαλωσία* is that of a *turba captivorum*, a crowd of captives, since the passage speaks of gifts in the man (in the human race), in men, presents consisting in men, whom He received and bore with Him into the same sanctuary.† This however the Apostle does not simply take up in his quotation, does not place it after the first clause without any connecting particle, but with *καί*, which denotes advance, something further, passes from the quotation over into the meaning: *and He gave.* For what God conquers, overcomes, leads with Himself, takes to Himself, makes His own, He does not wish to retain for Himself, but He transforms it, endows it, and makes it a gift: His captives become His servants, Israel's servants. He makes the enemies and antagonists of His theocracy its servants. So in a higher sense Christ; He made Saul Paul, the enemy and destroyer of His church an Apostle. God's taking, receiving, points to a subsequent giving, Christ's giving to a previous receiving. Thus the taking of gifts in men passes over into a giving for men, and the citation from David's Psalm the Apostle interprets as referring to Christ. By "men," *τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*, we must understand chiefly men conquered by Him, His men, to whom He has given gifts of grace, that they themselves may and can become gifts for men in wider circles (see ver. 11; Acts ii. 33).

After all this, it cannot be said that the citation is not from Ps. lxviii. 19, but *ex carmine, quod ab Ephesiis cantitari sciret* (STORR, FLATT), or that Paul did not know the exact words (RUECKERT), nor *nonnihil a genuino sensu detorsit, de suo adjecit* (CALVIN), or to invent an exegetical tradition from the Targums (which were made not earlier than the third century, and the Syriac and Arabic versions, altered to accord with the Apostle, and to suppose the Apostle had followed this (HOLZHAUSEN, MEYER and others). Nor should we go beyond the context, and find a reference, as in Col. ii. 15, to Satanic powers, which He has led captive (CHRYSOSTOM, BEZA, CALOV., BENGEL, STIER and others), since this does not comport with the Apostle's interpretation, or to the souls released from Hades (ESTIUS, DELITZSCH, *Psychology*, p. 358, and others), since enemies are spoken of. Finally we cannot infer from this passage in the Psalms and the use Paul makes of it this difference between the Old and New Testaments, that in the former God receives gifts from or among men, but in the latter gives to men (SCHENKEL).

[The real difficulty of this verse lies in the form of the last clause. That Paul quotes from the Psalm which has a Messianic reference, that Christ is represented as returning victoriously to heaven with a crowd of captives, is evident, and occasions no difficulty. But as the point of the section is Christ's *giving to men*, it is singular that the words: "gave gifts to men" are not found in the Psalm, which says: "received gifts among men" (בָּאָדָם, lit., in the man), or as Braune takes it, "consisting in men," *i. e.*, the captives. Dr. J. A. ALEXANDER (*Psalms, in loco*): "To *receive gifts* on the one hand and bestow gifts on the other are correlative ideas and expressions, so that Paul, in applying this description of a theocratic triumph to the conquests of our Saviour, substitutes one of these expressions for the other." If this be deemed satisfactory, and Braune's view, which obviates the difficulty in בָּאָדָם, be accepted, the solution is complete. But if the latter be rejected (see footnote on *αἰχμαλωσίαν*), then we can render the original passage: "has taken gifts among men" (the collective sense is clearly correct) and consider the whole phrase recast by the Apostle to express the correlative idea which is at hand, and which is contained in the further, fuller, and deeper meaning of the Psalm, here succinctly, suggestively and *authoritatively* unfolded (ELLICOTT). This seems to be more satisfactory than to attempt to prove that the Hebrew expresses this meaning. It may be admitted that it is often=*danda sumpsit* (as EADIE clearly proves) but that it means this in the Psalm in question is

* [The inspired and prophetic character of the Psalm, and its antiquity are undoubted (see HITZIG, HENGSTENBERG, DELITZSCH, against DE WETTE and EWALD). It was probably composed after a battle, and quite as probably (against EADIE) "at some bringing up of the ark to the hill of Zion," which took place after a victory (HENGSTENBERG: taking of Rabbah, 2 Sam. xii. 26). ALFORD, with reference to the return of the ark, says: "It is *therefore* a Messianic Psalm. Every part of that ark, every stone of that hill, was full of spiritual meaning. Every note struck on the lyres of the sweet singers of Israel, is but part of a chord, deep and world-wide, sounding from the golden harps of Redemption. The partial triumphs of David and Solomon only prefigured as in a prophetic mirror the universal and eternal triumph of the Incarnate Son of God. Those who do not know this, have yet their first lesson in the Old Testament to learn." Comp. *Doctr. Note* 3.—R.]

† [In the revision by Four Anglican Clergymen, *captives* is substituted for *captivity*. "A captivity" is a literal rendering which points to the concrete sense.—As regards this concrete sense, there is little difference of opinion, the only question being: Who are the captives? Obviously enemies who have been overcome, either (*a*) men who become His servants, those referred to in *τοῖς ἀνθρώποις* (Braune, following some fathers, HARLESS, OLSHAUSEN and others), who were previously prisoners of Satan (though Braune does not bring this out), or (*b*) Satan, sin, death (CHRYSOSTOM, BENGEL, MEYER, STIER, EADIE, ALFORD, HODGE, ELLICOTT); CALVIN seeks to combine the two. The former view greatly lessens the difficulty in the last clause of the quotation, helping to justify the substitution of the notion of *giving* for that of *receiving* in the original passage. But this very fact lays it open to suspicion as an exegesis for an emergency. The other view is favored by Col. ii. 15 (though not to be limited by the reference there), it preserves the analogy of the comparison, and gives a forcible meaning. Other views have been suggested, but not very probable ones.—R.]

very doubtful. The same view would render בָּאָדָם, *for men*, which becomes *to men*, after the bestowal of the gift. See Eadie *in loco*.—R.]

Ver. 9. **Now that he ascended**, τὸ δὲ ἀνέβη, taken from the ἀναβάς.—[Not the *word*, which does not occur in the passage quoted, but the *predicate*, which is contained in ἀναβάς (Meyer). The δέ introduces a slight explanatory *transition;* not strictly a *proof* (Hodge, Ellicott, following Hofmann and Meyer) of the correctness of the Messianic application of the passage cited, but a further explanation of what it means as thus applied. Meyer now (4th ed.) gives up his former view, remarking that such a proof was unnecessary and illogical, since the subject of the Psalm in its Messianic fulfilment was self-evident, and God Himself is conceived of in the Old Testament as ὁ καταβάς.—R.]

What is it [What does it imply] **but that he also descended** [τί ἐστιν εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ κατέβη].—Τί ἐστιν=what is thereby expressed (Matth. ix. 13; John xvi. 17 ff.; x. 6)? Ὅτι καὶ κατέβη, He has not merely ascended, but has also previously descended; the former presupposes the latter. Thus heaven is indicated as His original dwelling-place (John iii. 13) and His Person as that glorious, helping One, who can and will give gifts. [So Meyer. It is impossible to understand the verse otherwise than as indicating heaven to be the point of departure and the place of return for Him who descends and ascends. The doubt respects only the place whither He descended and whence He ascended. —R.]

Into the lower parts of the earth, εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς.—This closer definition of the descending evidently indicates the depths of the lower world, the subterranean world, which is below the surface of the earth; the genitive is partitive, governed by μέρη. The thought occurs in a variety of forms (Phil. ii. 10: καταχθονίων; Acts ii. 27, 31: εἰς ᾅδην; 1 Pet. iii. 19: ἐν φυλακῇ). The expression here corresponds to κατώτατα τῆς γῆς (Ps. lxiii. 10), grammatically τῆς γῆς might be the genitive of apposition (Winer, p. 494), like εἰς τὸ ὕψος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (Isa. xxxviii. 14). It is also true that the context up to this point would permit us to refer the phrase to the earth alone. But the following τὰ πάντα (ver. 10) and the design of the Apostle to show the power of Christ, require the fullest justifiable meaning of the expression, and hence the application to Hades. There is no reference to burial (Chrysostom and others), nor in accordance with Ps. cxxxix. 15 to the mother's womb (Calixtus and others).

[This interpretation of the phrase: "the lower parts of the earth" is the one anciently received, current among Romanist expositors, and adopted more recently by Bengel, Rueckert, Olshausen, Stier, Turner, Wordsworth, Alford and Ellicott. The other view: the lower parts, *viz.*, the earth, is accepted by the majority of modern commentators, such as Calvin, Grotius, Harless, De Wette, Hofmann, Hodge and Eadie (who gives a full statement of views and a good defence of this interpretation). It may be remarked that while one class of expositors may have been led to the one conclusion by a desire to sustain the article of the Apostles' Creed: "He descended into hell," the other may have been quite as much influenced by a fear of favoring the Romanist appendages to that article. Both views are alike grammatical, for while the positive would more naturally express the latter sense and the superlative the former, we have here the indefinite comparative, which may mean either. Doctrinally either view is admissible, while the considerations mentioned by Braune perhaps make the ancient view the preferable one. On Christ's descent into Hades, see Dr. Schaff's note, *Matthew*, pp. 228-229, and Lange and Mombert, *First Peter*, pp. 63 f., 67-72. Zanchius, Barnes and others favor the notion that the phrase signifies, in general, lowliness or humiliation, a view altogether untenable, because opposed to the context, and an unnecessary departure from the literal meaning.—R.]

Ver. 10. **He who descended, he it is also who ascended** [ὁ καταβὰς αὐτός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ ἀναβάς].—Both thoughts are here brought together, without οὖν, in a lively, joyous manner, marking the identity of the Person. Καταβάς stands first, having the emphasis, and αὐτός [*He*, emphatic], not ὁ αὐτός [*the same*, as in E. V.], gives prominence to the Person, who ascended out of the deepest depths, **above all the heavens**, ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν; the strongest antithesis to ver. 9. Under the term "heavens" there is no necessity for reckoning either three (Harless and others) according to 2 Cor. xii. 2, or seven (Meyer and others), according to the prevalent Jewish opinion.* Similar expressions: Heb. iv. 14; vii. 26.

That he might fill all things, ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα.—The Apostle thus gives the motive for what he has presented [in ver. 7]. There is nothing into which He cannot penetrate. Comp. i. 23. Τὰ πάντα designates all regions into which He can carry His gifts, can penetrate with His grace and glory, all regions and all persons within them.† There is no reference to a fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy (Anselm, Koppe and others), or to the completion of the work of Redemption (Rueckert and others); nor is it to be limited to Christians (Beza, Grotius, Schenkel and others), for He rules also among and in His enemies (Ps. cx. 2). Chrysostom is excellent: τοῦτό ἐστι τῆς ἐνεργείας αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς δεσποτείας, that He lets none slip, gives to every one, who has permitted himself to be conquered; the gracious and efficient presence of Him, the God-man, is thus established, and ver. 7 explained.

---

* [Alford: "It is natural that one who, like St. Paul, had been brought up in the Jewish habit of thought, should still use their method of speaking." But this does not imply an acceptation of such a division of the heavens; rather this: "Whatsoever heaven is higher than all the rest which are called heavens, into that place did He ascend" (Bish. Pearson in Ellicott).—R.]

† [So Hodge, Eadie, Alford and Ellicott. Even Dr. Braune does not attempt to justify the use made of this passage to defend the doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's body (*Form. Concord.*). On which Ellicott aptly says: "Christ is perfect God, and perfect and glorified man; as the former He is present *everywhere*, as the latter He can be present *anywhere*."—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The *idiosyncracy and freedom of the individual* is as little altered by the gift of Christ's grace as the former is of itself able to replace the latter by its own self-originated development. There must be *giving*, and indeed in this there is necessary a repeated proffering, making receptive or preparing, appropriating and preserving; the Lord offers ten times before we once receive, accept, take; so little does the Lord limit the freedom of the recipient. With the *gift* (*Gabe*), however, a *task* (*Aufgabe*) is at the same time appointed to the recipient: he must use it, gain with it. The gift does not obliterate national, corporate, local, temporal, individual differences, but purifies and ennobles them. Temperament and natural mental powers, talents and inclinations are only refined, directed, moved and used for the Lord's kingdom and our own salvation. "It is self-evident that the gifts of grace are not mere developments of the natural talents of the man,—but this does not deny that they are planted in a natural talent" (KAHNIS, *Lehre vom heil. Geist* I. p. 72).

2. *Christ is the Lord, who gives.* He has fought the fight of Redemption, and stands as a conqueror there; has overcome as the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and as the Lamb of God, who bears the sins of the world. He can give to every one and He is willing to do so. His *χρίσμα*, by means of which He makes men Christians, is a *χάρισμα*, grace in a special manner adapted to the individual. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 8 ff.

3. *Respecting the internal connection of the Old and New Testament*, as well as for *Hermeneutics* and *Homiletics*, much can be deduced from the application of this citation from the Psalms in our passage.

a. "The Apostle knows that what the Old Testament contains, the New Testament must also contain, only in a more glorious manner. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 7-11. He knows that however different according to the different relations, which are indicated in the very character of the Old Testament revelation, it still inheres in the nature of this unity of the two revelations, to bear witness of this unity to those who can and will seek it. All that was written aforetime was written *εἰς ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν* (Rom. xv. 4)." HARLESS. Besides the definite prophecies, there are in the Old Testament enough types and things typical of Christ and what has taken place in and through Him. What occurred in the people of Israel and is narrated as history or sung by holy men of old, is something pointing to the future; while at the time indeed it is accomplished fact or acute sketching of a living person, yet beyond this it has a validity for the Messianic period, so that when this comes in it is related to it as *σκιά* to *σῶμα*, shadow to body. In the Old Testament the Logos is concerned, but concealed, in all; in the New Testament manifested openly in all glory, full of grace and truth. The Jehovah of the Old Testament is the Redeemer in the New. Comp. RIEHM, *Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefs*, I. p. 131 ff.

b. Hermeneutics should perceive and show forth, in the acts of God narrated or sung in the Holy Scriptures, His administration, both going back to seek the preparatory and prophetic types, and forwards to point out the advancing accomplishment. But there must be a distinction made between what the passage to be expounded expresses as the sense and meaning of the writer, and what the deed or person, so simply and transparently described, signifies in the kingdom of God, in His people, of which signification the writer may be entirely unconscious. "The knowledge which looks back to the guidance of youth is the knowledge belonging to Christianity; the guidance of youth is the history of the Old Testament theocracy; the veil which rests on the guidance of youth disappears with the knowledge of manhood in Christ (2 Cor. iii. 4-16)." HARLESS. Every important poet, every skilful artist, may first perceive in the later inspection of his work thoughts therein, of which he neither was nor became conscious in making it. So in the Scripture often enough is there more than the writer had in his consciousness. [Comp. *Exeg.* and *Doctr. Notes*, *Galatians*, iv. 19-30. Even EADIE, who is most earnest in the effort to prove that the Apostle cites from the Psalm in accordance with its original and exact sense, says: "Our position is, that the same God is revealed as Redeemer both under the Old and New Testament, that the Jehovah of the one is the Jesus of the other, that Psalm lxviii. is filled with imagery which was naturally based on incidents in Jewish history, and that the inspired poet, while describing the interposition of Jehovah, has used language which was fully realized only in the victory and exaltation of Christ."—R.]

c. Homiletics may and should place the biblical history of the Old and New Testament, as a concrete manifestation of a Divine thought or of Divine guidance and ways, which enclose love and wisdom for men, besides others in the present life of the world or of individuals, in order to place these latter in that true light, which the former gives. For God and the Saviour Jesus Christ is the same in the Old and the New Testament, and at all times, ours as well, in His Church. GAUPP (*Homiletik* I. p. 174) calls this the *tropological* view. [Admitting both the usefulness of teachings drawn from analogy, since analogy, figure, type, *etc.*, all indicate the harmony of the Divine will in Creation, Providence and Redemption, and the propriety of such extensions and applications of the Old Testament on the part of an inspired Apostle, we must remember that our *tropological* exposition is not authoritative, and that we can base no doctrine or precept upon it, but only use it to elucidate established doctrine or enforce plain precept.—R.]

4. *The Christology of this passage.* It says that Christ is originally in heaven; there is His eternal dwelling-place. But He betook Himself into lowliness and penetrated the universe even to the lower regions, in order to fill all with His glory. He works as King, dispensing victoriously, where He has wrought as champion. His pre-existence is taken for granted, while we are especially taught His eternal activity of grace in all directions and for all times and for every man.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Only take what Christ gives thee; thou needst

envy no one.—Thankfully recognize what He has given to another; it benefits thee also.—Do not be satisfied with the natural endowments of your nation, your class, your family, or your intellect; let them be sanctified, purified, penetrated by grace in Christ. The most highly gifted natural man is always smaller and poorer than a living Christian (GOETHE, TERSTEEGEN).—Christ is King, Lord; His sword is His word, but this is a sword.—He has descended into the deep as a Redeemer: thy sin is not too deep and thy heart is not too bad: He can fill it.

STARKE:—Each member must be contented with his measure of gifts, received without pride, shared without envy.—Dear Christian, wilt thou ascend with Christ and reach His glory, then must thou first descend and suffer.

RIEGER:—No one has all, and no one need be concerned lest he come away entirely empty.—The origin of all gifts is to be found especially in the exaltation of Christ, which began with the victory over the rulers of darkness, over the principalities and powers who held us captive, who were themselves taken captive in the deep path of Christ's humiliation, and in the moment of Christ's death, when they believed they had gained the mastery over Him, must find and feel Him to be their Conqueror and Destroyer.

HEUBNER:—The diversity of gifts as respects degree and subject, should not occasion boasting or envy. In working together for the Kingdom of God there can be no envy; where there is envy, there the labor is for personal advantage.—Christ's Kingdom embraces also the invisible Kingdom of God. Would this be conceivable, were He a mere man?

PASSAVANT:—It has ever been the indiscretion and folly of men in the world, that they have forgotten the One Great Giver in the *gifts* and *gifted*, looking with especial astonishment to this teacher, with especial love to this benefactor, with especial admiration to this hero;—a virtual idolatry.—The main blow and the victory for all time and for eternity took place in and with the death of Christ—in and with His Resurrection.

STIER:—Each for himself and all together have to walk the same way in Christ.—The gifts of Christ are themselves at the same time men; all gifts of grace are pre-eminently official gifts.

[EADIE:—Ver. 7. The law of the Church is essential unity in the midst of circumstantial variety. Each gift in its own place completes the unity.—Ver. 9. Reproach and scorn and contumely followed Him as a dark shadow. Persecution at length apprehended Him, accused Him, calumniated Him, scourged Him, mocked Him, and doomed "the man of sorrows" to an ignominious torture and a felon's death. His funeral was extemporized and hasty; nay, the grave He lay in was a borrowed one. He came truly "to the lower parts of the earth."—Ver. 10. But as His descent was to a point so deep, His ascent is to a point as high. His position is the highest in the universe.—R.]

[HODGE:—Ver. 7. To refuse to occupy the place assigned to us in the Church, is to refuse to belong to it at all.—Vers. 9, 10. All other comings were typical of His coming in the flesh, and all ascensions were typical of His ascension from the grave.—It is God clothed in our nature who now exercises this universal dominion; and therefore the Apostle may well say of Christ, as the incarnate God, that He gives gifts unto men.—R.]

---

c. The organization and organism of the Church.

(CHAP. IV. 11–16.)

11 And he gave some, apostles [some to be apostles]; and some, prophets; and
12 some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; For [Unto][1] the perfecting of
the saints, for the work of the ministry [or of ministration], for the edifying [build-
13 ing up] of the body of Christ: Till we all come in [unto] the unity of the faith,
and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect [full-grown] man, unto the
14 measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: That we *henceforth* be no more [To
the end that we be no longer] children, tossed to and fro [tossed as waves], and
carried about with every wind of doctrine [teaching], by [in] the sleight of men,
and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive [in craftiness *tending* to
15 the system[2] of error]; But speaking [holding][3] the truth in love, may grow up into
16 him in all things, which [who] is the head, *even* Christ:[4] From whom the whole
[all the] body fitly joined [framed] together and compacted [,][5] by that which
every joint supplieth [by means of every joint of the supply], according to the ef-
fectual [*omit* effectual] working in the measure of every [each several] part,[6]
maketh increase [the growth] of the body unto the edifying [building up] of itself
in love.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 12.—[*Unto* is substituted for the preposition *for*, to indicate the difference in the Greek prepositions. *In order to, with a view to*, would express one view of the meaning of the verse, but *unto* suits the view of Dr. Braune better. *Ministration* is preferable to *ministry*, since the latter is now confined by usage to the office of the preacher and pastor. *Building up* is Saxon, *edifying* Latin.—R.]

[2] Ver. 14.—[ℵ. B.[1] D.[1] F. K. L. support the form μεθοδίαν, adopted by Tischendorf (ed. 7); but μεθοδείαν (*Rec.*) is preferable, "as changes in orthography which may be accounted for by itacism or some mode of erroneous transcription must always be received with caution" (Ellicott).—The periphrasis is necessary to express the force of πρός.—R.]

[3] Ver. 15.—[See *Exeg. Notes*, especially the additional footnote.—R.]

[4] Ver. 15.—[The article is found in the *Rec.*, ℵ.[3] D. F. K. L., most cursives, and is accepted by De Wette; but it is omitted in ℵ.[1] A. B. C., and rejected by Lachmann. Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott (now by Meyer). It occurs with Χριστός 31 times, and is omitted in 53 instances (Ellicott).—R.]

[5] Ver. 16.—[The view of the connection taken in the *Exeg. Notes* requires the insertion of a comma here, to indicate that the subsequent phrases qualify the main verb.—The less usual form: συνβιβασόμενον is sustained by ℵ. A. B. (?) C. D.[1] F. G., adopted by Tischendorf, Ellicott and others. Comp. iii. 6, where the usual euphonic changes in the prefixed preposition are ignored in the best MSS.—*Effectual* is omitted to avoid conveying the impression that the working is God's ἐνέργεια.—R.]

[6] Ver. 16.—[A. C., some versions and fathers sustain the reading μέλους, but it is probably a gloss occasioned by σῶμα; μέρους is found in ℵ. B. D. F. K. L., and accepted by all recent editors.—R.]

[7] Ver. 16.—[ℵ. D.[1] F. read αὐτοῦ, but ἑαυτοῦ is sustained by most authorities.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 11. *Christ's gift for the Church.*—**And he gave** [καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν].—"And" joins with what precedes ("that he might fill all things"), what follows, which has the former as its aim. As the clause of design (ver. 10) refers to the beginning (ver. 7: "according to the measure of the gift of Christ"), so the clause "he gave," αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν, refers back also (ver. 10: αὐτὸς, ver. 8: ἔδωκε, ver. 6: ἐδόθη).* Αὐτός gives emphatic prominence to the Person of the Giver, the Exalted One: He and none other. *Ipse, summa potestate;* and *repetitur ex v.* 10. *Ministri non dedere se ipsos* (BENGEL). It is not=ὁ αὐτός (SCHENKEL), nor is ἔδωκε=ἔθετο (THEOPHYLACT, HARLESS) in accordance with 1 Cor. xii. 28. [EADIE remarks (and ALFORD approves): "The idea is, that the men who filled the office, no less than the office itself, were a Divine gift." —R.] Nor should the aorist be pressed, so as to express only something momentary, passing; Paul is himself included, as one whom the Exalted One gave to be an Apostle; the historical fact is indicated. CALVIN has justly said: *et suscitat interdum prout temporum necessitas postulat*, although he accepts the first three classes of officers as belonging only to the beginning of the Church (*Institutes*, IV. 3, 4).

Some to be Apostles [τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους].—Τοὺς μέν, τοὺς δέ is not=ἐνίους, some [*i. e.*, some Apostles], since this is only a numeral, while the former expression points as a demonstrative to definite persons, whom He has prepared to be the gift, and given as ἀποστόλους. "Apostles" are those immediately called and equipped by the Lord to extend His work; they were especially endowed by Him, and had personally great advantages and prerogatives. First of all there were twelve; after the apostasy of Judas, Matthias was chosen by the disciples somewhat precipitately, before the day of Pentecost, while Paul was called by the Lord Himself as the twelfth.* Still Barnabas was called an apostle in connection with Paul (Acts xiv. 4, 14) and others also (Rom. xvi. 7; 2 Cor. viii. 23; Phil. ii. 25), hence this is not an abuse of the term (BLEEK), so that one might thus name those men, chosen and specially endowed by the Lord, appointed to found churches, as Boniface the Apostle of the Germans, Egede the Apostle of Greenland, Ziegenbalg and Schwartz the Apostles of India.

Some prophets.—"Prophets" are (ii. 20; iii. 5) men, who receive revelation (ἀποκάλυψις) from God, and, perceiving God's will and thought with clearness, announce the same with discretion and power; the prophet is μάντις, as far as he has revelation (1 Cor. xiv. 26); the latter becomes a prophet through interpretation; "glossarily" (to be distinguished from the Pentecostal miracle) is a morbid species of prophecy (1 Cor. xiv. 27 ff.). They appear in Acts xi. 27; xiii. 1; xv. 32; xxi. 10. They are concerned, not so much with the future (BENGEL) as with the eternal. To them correspond in the progress of ages those theologians with more profound insight into God's truth and will, as well as into the character and course of His Kingdom, such as Luther. [Comp. the excellent note of EADIE *in loco*. HODGE: "As the gift of infallibility was essential to the Apostolic office, so the gift of occasional inspiration was essential to the prophetic office."—R.]

And some evangelists.—"Evangelists," such as the deacon Philip (Acts xxi. 8; viii. 4-12), περιϊόντες ἐκήρυττον (THEODORET), as travelling missionaries† (NEANDER), but also in per-

* [ELLICOTT: "There is here no direct resumption of the subject of ver. 7, as if vers. 8-10 were merely parenthetical, but a regression to it; while at the same time the αὐτός is naturally and emphatically linked on to the αὐτός of the preceding verse. This return to a subject, without disturbing the harmony of the immediate connection or the natural sequence of thought, constitutes one of the high excellences, but at the same time one of the chief difficulties in the style of the great Apostle."—R.]

* [On the position of Matthias, comp. i. 1 and *Acts* (*in loco*). EADIE thus enumerates the essential elements of the apostolate: 1. That the Apostles should receive their commission immediately from the living lips of Christ. 2. That having seen the Saviour after He rose again, they should be qualified to attest to the truth of His resurrection. 3. They enjoyed a special inspiration. 4. Their authority was therefore supreme. 5. In proof of their commission and inspiration, they were furnished with ample credentials. 6. Their commission to preach and found churches was universal and in no sense limited. This statement, approved by ALFORD and ELLICOTT, involves further: That they have no personal successors, can have none; that no supreme authority exists in any ecclesiastical office, unless that office be the Apostolate. See further, *Galatians*, i. 1-5, *Doctr. Notes*; *Romans*, p. 59. —R.]

† [Dr. HODGE, in an excellent note here, remarks that the prevalent view at the time of the Reformation (see CALVIN in

manent positions (2 Tim. iv. 5; comp. 2 Cor. viii. 18), in consequence of their own view of the facts of the Gospel (John xvi. 26 ff.), or mediate tradition (Luke i. 1-4). It must not be referred to "those writing the Gospel" (CHRYSOSTOM); BENGEL also goes too far in ascribing to them *præterita;* they have to do with the life of the Lord in prophecy and fulfilment.

And some pastors and teachers, τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους.—JEROME: *Non ait, alios autem pastores et alios magistros, sed alios pastores et magistros, ut qui pastor sit, esse debeat et magister et nemo pastoris sibi nomen assumere debet, nisi possit docere quos pascit.* BENGEL: *Pastores et doctores hic pinguntur, nam pascunt* (and *regunt*) *docendo maxime, tum admonendo, corripiendo, etc.* The pastors are=προϊστάμενοι (Rom. xii. 8), who have the office of κυβέρνησις (1 Cor. xii. 28) and must be "apt to teach," διδακτικοί (1 Tim. iii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 24; Tit. i. 9), they are "bishops," ἐπίσκοποι (Acts xx. 28). Οἱ κατὰ πόλιν καὶ κώμην ἀφωρισμένοι in distinction from εὐαγγελισταί (THEODORET). BLEEK takes them as distinct; and he is right to this extent only, that the "teachers" are not always "pastors;" it is as "apostles and prophets" (ii. 20; iii. 5); hence despite this distinction, they form one category beside the previous ones.

[There has been much dispute whether these terms refer to two classes of stationary church officers, or to one whose twofold duty is indicated by two titles. The latter view is favored by the absence of the distinctive τοὺς δέ, and is accepted by AUGUSTINE, JEROME, BENGEL, HARLESS, OLSHAUSEN, MEYER, HODGE, EADIE and ALFORD.* The former is accepted by THEOPHYLACT, CALVIN, GROTIUS, NEANDER, DE WETTE, STIER, though the definitions of the distinction vary greatly. ELLICOTT says: "The ποιμένες (a term probably including ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι) might be and perhaps always were διδάσκαλοι, but it does not follow that the converse was true. The χάρισμα of κυβέρνησις is so distinct from that of διδασκαλία, that it seems necessary to recognize in the διδάσκαλοι a body of men (scarcely a distinct class) who had the gift of διδαχή, but who were not invested with any administrative powers and authority." Is the teacher then the parish schoolmaster or the professor of theology? or a preacher who does no pastoral duty? The Reformed Church polity has usually recognized the distinction (*Westminster Directory*, *Constitution* of Reformed [Dutch] Church in America, *etc.*), but practically it has amounted to nothing, as indeed little good has ever resulted from the attempt to reproduce accurately as *jure divino* those distinctions which expositors discover in the offices of the primitive Church. It may be remarked that while this phrase shows that every pastor ought to be a teacher, putting the former phase of duty first, it will ever be the case that through native endowment some ministers are better adapted for one part of the duty than for the other, though there is no warrant for total neglect of either, or for appointing in one congregation one minister to be pastor and another to be teacher; for the latter would nowadays take undue precedence of the former. Those who are "teachers," in our sense of the word, are also in the most important sense "pastors."—R.]

It is unmistakable that these four categories above named, so divide themselves, that the first three do not belong to a single congregation, but to the whole Church or a number of congregations, the last however is definitely appointed to one congregation. A gradation from higher to lower is noticeable also, in this manner, that the higher includes the lower grade or grades. Thus Jesus is called and calls Himself "Apostle" (Heb. iii. 1, after Jno. xx. 21); "Prophet" (Matt. xiii. 57; Luke xiii. 33; Acts iii. 22 ff., vii. 37); εὐαγγελιζόμενος (Luke iv. 18, 43; xx. 1); "Shepherd," ποιμήν (Jno. x. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 25); "Teacher" (Matt. xxiii. 8; Jno. xiii. 14). Accordingly BENGEL says: *Cum summis gradibus conjuncti poterant esse inferiores; omnes Apostoli simul etiam vim propheticam habuerunt. Sed prophetæ et evangelistæ non simul etiam Apostoli fuerunt.* Finally it must be noticed, that the offices themselves are not named here, and that in distinction from 1 Cor. xii. 28, the official *persons* stand in the foreground as gifts, in Corinthians the *gifts* of office, the offices themselves falling into the back-ground in both cases. See further, *Doctr. Notes* 1, 2.

Ver. 12. *The immediate aim of the activity of the persons in office.* [Note on the *relation and dependence* of the clauses of this verse. There is great difference of opinion, but of the various views those numbered (4) and (5) are most worthy of consideration. Braune adopts (4); but (5) seems to be preferable.

1. The clauses are taken as *co-ordinate* (CHRYSOSTOM, ZANCHIUS, BENGEL, E. V.), but this is opposed by the change of preposition, and in that case we would have a different order, the second clause would come first.

2. The trajection (GROTIUS, KOPPE and others), which actually put that clause first, is altogether unwarranted.

3. The second and third clauses are taken as parallel (by HARLESS and OLSHAUSEN), but as dependent on the first, in a partitive sense: some to teach, others to be edified. But there is nothing to indicate such a sense, and it is logically inadmissible, since the "saints" of one clause and "the body of Christ" of the other are identical.

4. Braune follows ERASMUS, DE WETTE, MEIER, FLATT, RUECKERT, SCHENKEL and many others, in taking the second and third as dependent on

---

loco) regarded this term as applied to "vicars of the Apostles," such as Luke Timothy, Titus. This is altogether untenable, and no doubt arose from the effort, made by CALVIN and others, to prove that all the offices referred to except that of "pastors and teachers," were of a temporary nature, and thus to establish the principle of "parity of the clergy."—R.]

* [ALFORD remarks that the figure in ποιμένες, if pressed, would imply that they were entrusted with some special flock, which they tended; and then the "teaching" would necessarily form a chief part of their work. EADIE says the former term implies careful, tender, vigilant superintendence and government, being the function of an overseer and elder. The official name ἐπίσκοπος ("bishop"), he adds, is used by the Apostle in addressing churches formed principally out of the heathen world (Ephesus, Philippi, Crete), while πρεσβύτερος ("elder"), the term of honor, is more Jewish in its tinge (Acts, Epistles of James, Peter and John). "Speaking to Timothy and Titus, the Apostle styles them elders (and so does the compiler of the Acts, in referring to spiritual rulers); but describing the duties of the office itself, he calls the holder of it ἐπίσκοπος."—R.]

the first, or rather the second dependent on the first and the third on the second. The meaning then is: "For the perfecting of the saints unto all that variety of service which is essential unto the edification of the body of Christ." As this view is fully presented below, the objections to it alone require mention at this point. These as urged by MEYER are: *a.* That as the context treats of offices in the Church, it is improper to enlarge the meaning of *διακονία* beyond that of official service (Rom. xi. 13; 2 Cor. iv. 1; vi. 3; comp. Acts vi. 4; 2 Cor. iii. 7 ff.; ix. 12, *etc.*). *b.* That with such a meaning *πάντων* would have been so essentially necessary with *ἁγίων*, that it could not have been omitted. These objections are sufficiently strong to lead him to adopt the next view.

5. The second and third clauses are taken as co-ordinate, and dependent on *ἔδωκε*, "he gave;" the first expressing the more *ultimate* and final purpose (*πρός*) of the action, the other two the more immediate end (*εἰς*). This view is adopted by ALFORD, ELLICOTT, HODGE, EADIE (2d ed.), and gives this sense: "He gave Apostles, *etc.*,—to fulfil the works of the ministry, and to build up the body of Christ, His object being to perfect His saints." So HOFMANN substantially. The great objection is the strange order which place the more ultimate end first, but as the difficulty seems to inhere in the Apostle's own choice of prepositions, it is not decisive against this view. While preferring it, I would not insist on its correctness, but, leaving Dr. Braune's notes as they stand, add in footnotes the requirements of this interpretation.—R.]

Unto the perfecting of the saints [*πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων*].—*Πρός* marks the end aimed at, *viz.:* "the perfecting of the saints." *Καταρτισμός*, occurring only here, like *κατάρτισις* in 2 Cor. xiii. 9 designates the re-establishment of an affair, so that it is *ἄρτιος* (only 2 Tim. iii. 17, *τέλειος*, various reading), *integer*, as it should be (1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Gal. vi. 1; 1 Thess. iii. 10; Heb. x. 5; xi. 3; xiii. 21; 1 Pet. v. 10). *Non potuit honorificentius verbi ministerium commendare, quam dum hunc illi effectum tribuit* (CALVIN). Through the ministers of Christ the Christians should become complete, perfect.* For what purpose?

For the work of the ministry [or of **ministration**, *εἰς ἔργον διακονίας*].—Hence there is no thought of merely external increase (PELAGIUS, BEZA). *Εἰς* marks that for which the saints should become expert, complete. The nouns, without the article, have here a more general meaning: *ἔργον* indicates the efficiency of the *διακονίας*, and the latter denotes that every work which it does, is a service to our neighbor and then to the whole. *Διακονία* is a general service (2 Tim. iv. 11; 2 Cor. xi. 8). This meaning is demanded here by the context, the connection with the saints, the members, each one of which has his office (Rom. xii. 4) and needs the other (1 Cor. xii. 21). Comp. 2 Tim. iii. 17: *πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρτισμένος*. It must not be referred to church service, ecclesiastical office, the diaconate in a technical sense (MEYER).* Comp. on ver. 16.

For the building up of the body of Christ, *εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*.†—The aim of the "ministry" is again subjoined with the preposition *εἰς*. So great is the significance of the preparing of Christians through the ministers of the Church to ministering activity in the congregation! The body of Christ is there, it exists, but new members are continually incorporated in it, it extends and increases; hence both of the figures derived from the body (i. 23; ii. 20–22) are included. LUTHER is very good: "that the saints may be fitted to the work of the ministry, that thus the body of Christ may be edified." Accordingly the three clauses are not co-ordinate (CHRYSOSTOM, BENGEL and others); nor are the two subjoined with *εἰς* co-ordinate (RUECKERT, MEYER, HARLESS and others), nor yet dependent on *ἔδωκε*, as some think, while others make them dependent on *καταρτισμόν*. Quite as little can we accept a trajection of the second number before the first (GROTIUS, KOPPE and others). [See above for a classification of opinions.—R.] Comp. *Doctr. Note* 3.

Ver. 13. *The end of the perfecting.* **Till we all come** [*μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες*].—*Μέχρι* denotes the final, highest aim, not the beginning and entrance of the same, *ἄχρι*, but the presence and enjoyment of it (TITTMANN, *Syn.* I. p. 33 ff.). [Comp. Dr. SCHAFF's note, *Romans*, p. 181.] *Καταντήσωμεν*, the conjunctive without *ἄν* denotes simply the future; the verb itself however is = *φθάνειν* (ŒCUMENIUS), the arriving at the destination, as frequently in the Acts (xvi. 1; xviii. 19, 24, *etc.*), in a local sense; here and Phil. iii. 11 however in the spiritual sense, prominence being given to the free movement, which is occasioned, strengthened and animated by the educating *καταρτισμός*.‡

Under the term *οἱ πάντες*, "all," = *οἱ ἅγιοι*, as a complete whole, the Apostle includes him-

* [HODGE gives the following meanings which have been suggested here: 1. The completion of the saints ("the number of the elect"). 2. Their renewing or restoration. 3. Their reduction to order and union as one body. 4. Their preparation for service (so Braune). 5. To their perfecting. The last he prefers, as is required by the view taken of the relation of the clauses.—R.]

* [The term is not to be restricted to the *diaconate*, nor to the *ministry*, *i.e.*, the office of pastor and teacher (HODGE), but seems to refer to "spiritual service of an *official* nature" (so MEYER). Hence *ministration* is preferable to the more technical word *ministry*, though Braune extends the signification in accordance with his view. On the absence of the article ELLICOTT remarks: "*Διακονία* may possibly have been left studiously anarthrous in reference to the different modes of exercising it alluded to in ver. 11, and the various spiritual wants of the Church; *ἔργον* however seems clearly definite in meaning, though by the principle of *correlation* (Middleton, *Art.* iii. 3, 6) it is necessarily anarthrous in form."—R.]

† [ELLICOTT remarks that this clause is parallel to, but at the same time more nearly defining the nature of the *ἔργον*. The article is not required, as edifying generally is the object. There is no confusion of metaphors, since both words have a distinct metaphorical meaning, where the original allusion is in a measure lost.—R.]

‡ [All reference to coming together from different starting-points, or coming out of previous wanderings is imaginary (MEYER). ELLICOTT remarks that too much weight must not be laid on the omission of *ἄν* as giving an air of less uncertainty to the subjunctive, since there was an evident tendency in later Greek to omit it in such cases, adding: "the use of the subjunctive (the mood of conditioned but objective possibility), not future (as Chrysostom) shows that the *καταντᾶν* is represented not only as the eventual but as the *expected* and *contemplated* result of the *ἔδωκεν*."—R.]

self; it is therefore implied that those in whom there has been a beginning of πίστις (HARLESS), even the greatest, the Apostles, are in need of progress towards the goal, are not yet there, even although in advance of others, but further their own progress when they labor for others (Phil. iii. 13, 14; Rom. i. 11, 12). Accordingly "all" is not to be extended to all men (JEROME). BENGEL is excellent: *Ne apostoli quidem se putarunt metam assecutos, nedum ecclesia. Semper proficiendum fuerat, non standum, nedum deficiendum. Et nunc ecclesia ideam sui optimæ non a tergo respiciat oportet, sed ante oculos habeat, ut futuram, etiam num assequendum. Notate hoc, qui antiquitatem non tam sequimini, quam obtenditis.*

Unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, *εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.*—The preposition marks the goal. The repeated article demands absolutely, that "faith" and "knowledge" be kept apart as distinct, independent ideas, although the genitive which they have in common ("of the Son of God") occasions a connection by means of the copulative conjunction. "Faith" designates the immediate possession, "knowledge" the assurance obtained by means of knowing (MATTHIES); the former is applicable to an ethical, the latter to an intellectual sphere; the latter proceeds constantly anew from the former, the former is itself the permanent beginning, the constant principle, not merely an initiatory stage to be surpassed; both belong together accordingly. The unity of both, since "one faith" is presupposed (ver. 5), refers to the various degrees of clearness and power in the individual members (*οἱ πάντες*), to littleness of faith, weakness of faith, want of maturity, *etc.* Accordingly the genitive, "of the Son of God," defines both more closely, indicating that they are as strong, as He possessed them, and that thus we, being God's children who will grow up and become educated, should possess them; He is the Author and Finisher of our faith (Heb. xii. 2) and knowledge, thus Example and Standard. If He is not the object, there is neither faith nor knowledge at all. Hence it is the genitive *subjecti* (STIER), not *objecti*, as most consider it. But unity of faith and knowledge is not meant, either alone (OLSHAUSEN), or in connection with the other meaning (STIER); we should rather refer it to the unity of the individuals, of the church-members, which is effected by the faith and knowledge of Christ.

[The view of OLSHAUSEN is, that the unity is the state in which faith and knowledge are identified; *fides implicita* developing into *fides explicita* (BISPING). EADIE and ALFORD virtually accept this as included here, the latter citing DE WETTE: "True and full unity of faith is then found, when all thoroughly know Christ, the object of faith, alike, and that in His highest dignity as the Son of God." But the second term is not epexegetical of the first, and faith is not to be lost in knowledge, but abides (1 Cor. xiii. 13).—The strong word ἐπίγνωσις must be noticed. If any prefer the more common view of the genitive as that of the object, the following statement (HODGE) will be satisfactory: "Faith and knowledge express or comprehend all the elements of that state of mind of which the Son of God is the object—a state of mind which includes the apprehension of His glory, the appropriation of His love, as well as confidence and devotion. This state of mind is in itself eternal life." "The unity of faith is now confined to the first principles; the unity of faith contemplated in this place is that perfect unity which implies perfect knowledge and perfect holiness."—R.]

Unto a full-grown man, *εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον.*—The singular marks the unity of the Church, which grows up into a perfect man.* Here a "development" (*werden*) is spoken of, which is involved in the *καταντᾷν*; the Church, the body of Christ, becomes a personality educated and completed to the perfect life-degree of Christ. For *τέλειος* is the opposite of *νήπιος* (ver. 14); like 1 Cor. iii. 1; ii. 6 and Heb. v. 13, 14, it means one in ripe, full manhood.

Unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ [*εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*].—"Unto the measure of the stature" points to a definite measure; it does not therefore extend *in infinitum.* Ἡλικία from *ἧλιξ*, *qui adultæ et maturæ ætatis est*, certainly designates, as in Luke xix. 2, the stature, the bodily size, elsewhere (Matt. vi. 27; Luke xii. 25; ii. 52; Heb. xi. 11; Jno. ix. 21, 23) however, the age, generally the age of manhood; it is, more fully expressed, the maturity, the full growth, and in accordance with the context the spiritual maturity (STIER).† The genitive: *τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, "of the fulness of Christ," defines more precisely the measure of the maturity: it is conditioned by the fulness, the state of being filled, which comes from Christ, accordingly by Himself, who lives in it and by His gifts and powers. We should become perfect, as He, the Head was, 1 Cor. xii. 12. Hence LUTHER is incorrect: in the measure of perfect age; for *πληρώματος* is not to be made an adjective quali-

* ["Metaphorical apposition to the foregoing member, the concrete term being probably selected rather than any abstract term, as forming a good contrast to the following *νήπιοι* (ver. 14), and as suggesting by its 'singular' the idea of the complete unity of the holy personality, further explained in the next clause into which they were united and consummated" (ELLICOTT). As a curiosity ALFORD cites from AUGUSTINE (*Civ. Dei*, xxii. 17): "*Nonnulli, propter hoc quod dictum est, Eph. iv. 13, nec in sexu fœmineo resurrecturas fœminas credunt, sed in viriti omnes aiunt.*"—R.]

† [As the word undoubtedly means either *stature* or *age*, the latter being more common, or perhaps includes both, like the German *Erwachsenheit*, the sense here must be determined by considerations drawn from the passage itself. KOPPE, HOLZHAUSEN, HARLESS, MEYER, HODGE prefer the sense: *age*, because "full-grown men," "children" (ver. 14), point to this; the phrase which follows is then a characterizing genitive. But "measure" seems more appropriately used in reference to "stature" and the idea of magnitude is indicated by the words "fulness," "grow up" (ver. 15) and by the figure of ver. 16. This sense is adopted by ERASMUS, GROTIUS, BENGEL, RUECKERT, STIER, EADIE, ELLICOTT, ALFORD. It may be added that πλήρωμα does not refer to the Church (STORR and others), nor to the knowledge of Christ (GROTIUS). The genitive τοῦ Χριστοῦ is a genitive subjective: *Christ's fulness*: "This stature grows just as it receives of Christ's fulness; and when that fulness is wholly enjoyed, it will be that of a 'perfect man'" (EADIE). Some of the Fathers referred this passage to the resurrection, teaching that man shall rise from the grave in the perfect age of Christ, having the form and aspect of thirty-three years of age, the age of Christ at His death. See MEYER, who has a note on the time of fulfilment in which he brings out his favorite views about the Second Advent and Paul's expectation of its speedy coming.—R.]

fying *ἡλικία*. The explanation: full gracious presence of Christ (HARLESS) is insufficient; still more so the meaning given by RUECKERT: Christ stands *before* us as the *ideal* of manly size and beauty.—Whether this goal will be reached in this life or only in the next, is decided by *πίστις* in the context, to this extent, that we must refer it to this life also, although indeed many a one first attains unto it in the future life, since this coming to the appointed goal extends through centuries. Comp. *Doctr. Notes* 4, 5.

The purpose, vers. 14, 15. *a*) *negatively*, ver. 14; *b*) *positively*, ver. 15.

Ver. 14. **To the end that we be no longer children** [*ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι*].—Ἵνα sets forth the purpose, which aims at the fulfilment of *μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι*, and this must accordingly take place before the goal is reached, "unto a perfect man." It is not to be joined to ver. 13 (SCHENKEL),* but to vers. 11, 12, more particularly to *ἔδωκε*, and unfolds wherein the "perfecting of the saints" consists. As the Apostle, who, although the most advanced, still in humble sense of fellowship, bears and suffers in the imperfection of the Church, includes himself (*ὦμεν*), we must not find here a reproach, but a point or state of transition, which does not continue, hence *μηκέτι*, which does not recall false teachers in Christendom generally (MEYER). The Gentiles are not yet *νήπιοι*; Christians in their incipiency are such (Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21; 1 Cor. iii. 1; viii. 11; Gal. iv. 13; Heb. v. 13); they should not however remain so, but advance to ripe manhood.

Tossed to and fro [as waves] and carried about [*κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι*].—This describes more closely the *νηπιότης*, with reference to appearances and experiences observed and felt in the churches, inclusive of the false teachers who had appeared and would appear. "Tossed as waves"† (*fluctuantes*, Vulgate), moved as waves, *intrinsecus, sursum deorsum, etiam citra ventum* (BENGEL), "and carried about," *extrinsecus, huc illuc, aliis nos adorientibus* (BENGEL), describes the ready excitability of the unsubstantial, the immature (Jas. i. 6; Heb. xiii. 9; Jude 12); they are dependent on their surroundings, on influences and insinuations, are moved:

By every wind of teaching, *παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας*.—The wind has a great variety (*παντί*), from the *aura seculi, levis aura popelli* to the strong continuing trade-wind, and as to its origin from coarse to refined carnal interests, as well as in its tendency toward aims against the Church or in favor of a false church. [The dative is the dynamic dative, KRUEGER.—R.] "Teaching" is introduced under the figure of the wind, because it is something pneumatic and because, as the wind in proportion to its strength or the free situation of the water, stirs this from ripples to foam, so the teaching sets in motion the spirit of the *νήπιος*, which is so easily tossed to and fro. The *νήπιος* will learn, know; that is the proper way to perfection. But beside the one wholesome teaching of truth there appears the multifarious teaching of error as a great danger,* and the greater because it works, moves, attracts and hurries along:

In the sleight of men.—Ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ, belonging to the participles, refers with the article to "teaching;" through the sleight befitting the doctrine, and with the substantive (from *κύβος*, die), to dice-playing, in order to denote, that the teachers deal with the Scriptures and the truth and men, as players with dice (LUTHER). [Braune agrees with DE WETTE, MEYER, HODGE, and the E. V., in regarding *ἐν* as instrumental, but as this seems pleonastic after the dative, "and would mar the parallelism with *ἐν ἀγάπῃ* (ver. 15), the preposition appears rather to denote the element, the evil atmosphere as it were in which the varying currents of doctrine exist and exert their force" (ELLICOTT). So HARLESS, OLSHAUSEN, EADIE and ALFORD.—R.] The genitive ("of men") indicates that the *νήπιοι* stand under the influence of *men*, instead of their placing themselves under the guidance of *Christ* (MEYER), and also under that of many instead of one. But this is not all; the added parallel clause carries the matter further; there is not only human sleight, *temeritas*, but a plan also:

In craftiness tending to the system of error [*ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης*].—Ἐν connects with the previous phrase. Πανουργίᾳ corresponds with *κυβείᾳ*, and gives prominence to what the latter does not indicate, the *nequitia*, the conscious malice; hence it is incorrect to find this in the previous phrase (HARLESS, STIER). The article can be dispensed with, since the closer qualification is added. The preposition, as in ver. 12 (*πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμόν*), denotes toward what the craftiness proceeds (WINER, p. 378). This is *τὴν μεθοδείαν* (only here and vi. 11, where the plural is used), which is derived from *μεθοδεύειν*, to follow in order to track up something, then *machinare*, meaning therefore *machinatio*, crafty pursuing (LUTHER: *erschleichen*, to sneak upon), to follow and come upon in a sneaking manner; in this there is found pre-arrangement, system. The principle which *μεθοδεύει* is indicated by the genitive *τῆς πλάνης*.

* [SCHENKEL'S view is somewhat novel. He takes our verse as giving the purpose of ver. 13, and to the objection that this places perfection before the state of childhood answers, that the last verse refers to the whole Church, this to individuals. Because the whole Church is perfect, the members should be no longer children. But this is very unsatisfactory. The two leading views are those of HARLESS and MEYER. The former takes our verse as *co-ordinate* with ver. 13, and immediately dependent on vers. 11, 12, giving the purpose of the ministry (so FLATT, BLEEK, HODGE). MEYER, who has a clear statement of the case *in loco*, takes this verse as *subordinate* to ver. 13, and remotely dependent on vers. 11, 12. He holds that ver. 13 defines the "*terminus ad quem*," which characterizes the functions of the Christian ministry, while ver. 14 thus explains the object, our ceasing to be children, contemplated in the appointment of such a "*terminus*," and thence more remotely in the bestowal of a ministry so characterized. To the former view there is the decided grammatical objection that a clause introduced by *ἵνα* is made co-ordinate with those introduced by *εἰς*, in that case too ver. 13 would follow vers. 14, 15. The latter view avoids these difficulties without being open to the logical objection which probably led to the adoption of the former.—R.]

† [Not by the waves, like a deserted ship, as MEYER and others hold, but like the billow itself.—R.]

* [EADIE: "The article *τῆς* before *διδασκαλίας* gives definitive prominence to 'the teaching,' which, as a high function respected and implicitly obeyed, was very capable of seducing, since whatever false phases it assumed, it might find and secure followers." The substantive is abstract and general; *teaching* is preferable to *doctrine*, because it brings out the active agency employed with more distinctness.—R.]

This is not *error mentis*, but lying, the opposite of ἀλήθεια (1 John iv. 6); hence, especially as τοῦ διαβόλου is added in vi. 11, BENGEL is on the right track when he says: *i. e., Satanæ.** It is true the πλάνη is in the main only personified (MEYER); but it has a kingdom and a πνεῦμα, that operates through men, the false teachers (τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων), as through serviceable tools, proper instruments.

Ver. 15. **But holding the truth in love, may grow up into him,** ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτόν, is to be joined with ἵνα (ver. 14) as the antithesis (δέ) to "no longer children." Hence LUTHER is incorrect: "but let us be honest in love and grow." Christians (οἱ πάντες, ver. 13), not merely teachers, are the subject. Αὐξάνειν is simply to grow, not to remain νήπιος, to come out of the νηπιότης. *Hæc αὔξησις, augmentatio* (ver. 16), *media est inter infantes et virum* (BENGEL). Accordingly εἰς points to the goal; hence "into Him" (MATTHIES, STIER); it corresponds to the εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, we should become a perfect man, as He is. The phrase "Head" from the following relative clause should not be pressed (HOFMANN, MEYER), in order to make the meaning still more difficult; τὰ πάντα stands between, and this accusative of reference will not allow εἰς αὐτόν to be=grow in respect to Him (MEYER), whatever that may mean. ["Unto and into Him," as the goal and standard of our growth, with a secondary thought apparently of the incorporation of all the Church in Christ, which is developed in the subsequent context. The phrase is not to be joined with "in love" (HARLESS).—R.] Still less can it mean: *ipsius cognitione* (GROTIUS), *virtute et influxu* (A-LAPIDE).

While εἰς αὐτόν denotes the goal of the growth, ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ designates the condition under which, the state in which it takes place. Hence the two are to be joined: true in love. Ἀληθεύειν is=ἀληθὴς εἶναι (PASSOW, *sub voce*); the context explains it further. In the New Testament only here and Gal. iv. 16. There ὑμῖν indicates that it means speaking the truth, here the context is a different one. While αὐξήσωμεν forms an antithesis to νήπιοι ὦμεν, ἀληθεύοντες stands in contrast to the manner of such ("tossed as waves and carried about") and to "teaching" in general, as well as that of the deceitful false teachers in particular. BENGEL is excellent: VERANTES, LUTHER (Gen. xlii. 16): if you design truth. The whole personality is spoken of, in walk and nature, and the meaning is more than merely: to be true in speech, *verum dicere* (HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 130, MEYER).*

Ἐν ἀγάπῃ sets forth the sphere or element in which the ἀληθεύειν moves; ἀγάπη and ἀλήθεια are correlative ideas.† Comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 6. Love is here entirely undefined, hence general: love for the truth, for the brethren, who come into danger through false teachers, or themselves become false teachers, to the Church as a whole, to God. There is accordingly no reference to forbearance toward error (HARLESS), or love towards those of different profession (MEYER), or something of the same; nor is ἐν=διά (SCHENKEL), or σύν, or merely upright in love (LUTHER and others).

In all things who is the head, even Christ [τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστός].—Τὰ πάντα.‡ without a preposition, as 1 Cor. ix. 25; x. 33; xi. 2, or with κατά (Col. iii, 20) denotes, on account of the article, all, to which reference has been made, into which we must grow: faith, knowledge, truth, love, *etc.* "Who is the Head, even Christ," with great emphasis, in order to furnish a motive for growing up into Him. We might have found τὸν Χριστόν, in apposition to εἰς αὐτόν, but it can either be in apposition to ἡ κεφαλή, or in the first instance still be in the nominative (WINER, p. 495).

Ver. 16. *Comprehensive conclusion.*—**From whom,** ἐξ οὗ, marks the cause, the source, and as the context demands, a continuing one. Christ is the goal (εἰς αὐτόν) and the source of the life-development of the Church (MEYER). If then CHRYSOSTOM says: σφόδρα ἀσαφῶς ἡρμήνευσε τῷ πάντα ὁμοῦ θελῆσαι εἰπεῖν, an exact analysis of the sentence will show what is incorrect (ἀσαφῶς). Col. ii. 19 is parallel.

a. The subject.—**All the body fitly framed together and compacted** [πᾶν τὸ σῶμα συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συνβιβαζόμε-

* [On the reading μεθοδείαν see *Textual Note* 2. As to its meaning, we may remark that the bad sense is not necessarily inherent in the term, which signifies: "a deliberate planning or system." Still here the bad sense is fixed on it by the genitive which follows, and we might render it: *stratagem*, though in the full phrase, "system of error," the meaning is sufficiently evident. EADIE renders "a system," but "the system of error" is one. The force of the preposition can be brought out in English only by a periphrasis: *tending to, leading to*, not *according to*. The word πλάνης here includes the idea of deceit no doubt, but is perhaps better expressed by *error*, "error in its most abstract nature." The genitive is subjective, the error plans and machinates. That the Apostle meant to characterize "error" as evil, morally as well as intellectually wrong, is evident enough from the context. When RUECKERT says that this was Paul's weak side, to stigmatize those in error, in a spirit of dogmatical defiance, he betrays his usual incapacity for comprehending the Apostle. If truth be not sanctifying, and error demoralizing, then the Scriptures and human experience are alike at fault.—R.]

* [Though the more extended meaning is stoutly denied by MEYER, it is accepted by CALVIN, DE WETTE, RUECKERT, ALFORD, HODGE, EADIE and ELLICOTT. The difficulty is to express the sense in English: *being true* is literal, but not satisfactory; *walking truthfully, walking in truth*, though giving the correct sense, would be inapt here; *holding the truth* is the best rendering, if the care is taken not to give an objective sense to truth."—Comp. the remarks of ALFORD (who renders: *being followers of truth*) and ELLICOTT.—R.]

† [The question of connection is much disputed. Many, perhaps most, join "in love" with the participle (CALVIN, GROTIUS, ALFORD, RUECKERT, HODGE, STIER, BLEEK among others), while HARLESS, MEYER, OLSHAUSEN, EADIE and ELLICOTT connect it with the verb "grow." In favor of the former, the order, the parallelism of structure with ver. 14, the otherwise feeble and awkward position of the participle at the beginning of the sentence, Paul's habit of subjoining his qualifying phrases, and the vital association between love and truth, may be urged. The latter view is supported by MEYER as better agreeing with his rendering of the participle: speaking the truth; he urges also that "in love" ought to be joined with the same verb as in ver. 16, and that thus "in love," at the beginning here and at the close there, receives its due emphasis. Still the other seems preferable, for the connection in verse 16 is equally open to discussion. It is not "a '*fiat justitia, ruat cœlum*' truthfulness: but must be conditioned by love; a true-seeking and true-being with loving caution and kind allowance" (ALFORD).—R.]

‡ [This is the accusative of the *quantitative* object (ELLICOTT); "we are to grow in all those things in which the Christian must advance" (OLSHAUSEN).—R.]

νον].—"All the body" takes the term "all" (ver. 13) as a unity; the main idea is that of totality. ["All the body," which the E. V. gives in Col. ii. 19, is perhaps preferable to "the whole body," the idea being of the entire body as including every member, rather than of the body as a whole (*τὸ πᾶν σῶμα* more accurately expresses this). The latter notion becomes the stronger one in the close of the verse.—R.] The double definition, "fitly framed together and compacted," describes the Church in its present development (present participle). The first adjective (see ii. 21; of a building) indicates the individual parts and members (*ἁρμός*, groove, joint, member), which are printed together (*σύν*), the other, used more precisely of men who enter into a society, marks these members as individuals, as persons. In this the difference and the reason of the double expression is found. In such a union the Church is conceived of, because it is a building; besides a society is spoken of, a society of persons, a congregation. Accordingly such a two-fold designation sets forth, either the figure and fact (MEYER) or harmony and solidity (BENGEL). ELLICOTT suggests, in accordance with the simple meaning of the words, that the latter term refers to the *aggregatim*, the former to the *inter-adaptation* of the component parts.—R.]

[**By means of every joint of the supply.**—This phrase, which presents more difficulties than any other in our verse, is discussed below by Dr. Braune, who joins it with the *predicate*, not with the *subject* (*i. e.*, as a qualification of the participle) as is done in the E. V. The latter view of the connection is adopted by the majority of commentators (so HODGE, EADIE, ELLICOTT), and is favored by the position of the phrase and the parallel, Col. ii. 19. The former is defended by MEYER, STIER, ALFORD, CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, BENGEL). It may be remarked in favor of this, that it gives more perspicuity to the passage, "the whole instrumentality and modality here described belonging to the growth" (ALFORD), the repetition of *σῶμα* is more natural in an involved predicate, while the complicated subject is much more awkward. As regards the parallel, the position there is totally different. It ought to be added that the earlier defenders of this view advocated a sense of the word *ἁφή* (=*αἴσθησις*, the perception of the vital energy imparted from the head), which did not admit so readily of the connection with the participles. Still Braune's view is preferable.—R.]

b. The predicate.—**Maketh the growth of the body,** *τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται*.—Col. ii. 19: *αὔξη τὴν αὔξησιν*. The repetition of *τοῦ σώματος* ("of the body") instead of *ἑαυτοῦ* ("itself") marks the permanent effect proceeding from the cause, and as compared with Christ's continued influence, puts into the background the self-development as an entirely independent one. Only when the principle of life in the Church has grown and been strengthened through Christ, does it become perceptible (*εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ*); yet it is already indicated by the middle (*ποιεῖται*). This repetition is therefore not to be explained by the distance of the predicate from the subject (*σῶμα*) as an effort at distinctness (MEYER), or as negligence (RUECKERT), or as a Hebraism (GROTIUS), or because the interest of individuals is not under discussion (HARLESS, STIER).*

The predicate is then enlarged by a designation of the means: **by means of every joint of the supply** [*διὰ πάσης ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας*].—'Αφή (from *ἅπτεσθαι*) cannot according to Col. ii. 19, where it is put in one category with *συνδέσμων* and connected with *ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συνβιβαζόμενον*, mean the same band, yet must be something similar.† It cannot be=*αἴσθησις* (CHRYSOSTOM), sensation (MEYER), contact (HOFMANN). Since *ἁφὴν ἔχειν* means to have something enchaining, enticing (PASSOW, *sub voce*), and the singular is found here, the most natural and correct meaning will be: connection or grasp. 'Επιχορηγία (from *χορηγία*) means to lead a choir, to defray the expenses of a choir, to render a public service, the contribution to expenditures, public, common rendering of service; accordingly the growth of the Church is by means of every grasp of contribution or service rendered (genitive *objecti*, and not of apposition, SCHENKEL, nor=*πρός*, GROTIUS, HOFMANN and others).

[To this view of Dr. Braune it may be objected that it loses sight of the strict anatomical figure without substituting for it the subtler interpretation of Chrysostom and others. It seems better to take *ἁφή* in the sense indicated by Col. ii. 19, and render it "joints." The qualifying genitive is as ELLICOTT remarks: "a kind of genitive *definitions*, by which the predominant use, purpose, or destination of the *ἁφή* is specified and characterized." "The joints are the points of union where the supply passes to the different members, and by means of which the body derives the supply by which it grows" (ALFORD). HODGE is undoubtedly correct in interpreting this supply as "the Divine life or Holy Spirit communicated to all parts of the Church" (against Braune, who seems to refer it to the service rendered by the individual members), but it is very doubtful whether he is right in saying that the *ἁφαί* "are the various spiritual gifts and offices which are made the channels or means of this Divine communication." Most recent commentators have wisely refrained from thus particularizing. Certainly when these *ἁφαί* are taken as meaning the officers mentioned in ver. 11, despite all saving clauses, a step is taken toward the Romanist and High Anglican view of the clergy. The figures of Scripture, through wrested and strained interpretation, have been made subservient to great error.—R.]

According to the working in the measure of each several part [*κατ' ἐνέργειαν*

* [The repetition is generally regarded as made for the sake of perspicuity, especially as *ἑαυτοῦ* is found in the next clause. Perhaps however the body as a whole comes more into view now.—The middle is apparently not so much reflexive as *intensive* and indicative of the energy with which the spiritual process is carried on (EADIE, WORDSWORTH, ELLICOTT).—R.]

† [In *Colossians* (p. 55) Braune seems to limit the word to "nerves," in accordance with the view which joins each of the substantives there used with one of the participles. As this is scarcely tenable (see *in loco*), and as the article is not repeated with the second substantive in that passage, the category "joints and bands" decides yet more definitely against any interpretation of this word which removes it out of the general class of the anatomical arrangements.—R.]

ἐν μέτρῳ ἑνὸς ἑκάστου μέρους].—This qualifies the phrase which precedes. Κατ' ἐνέργειαν, without the article on account of the following qualification (i. 19; iii. 7), defines the ἐπιχορηγία as an efficient one, while the proportion of this efficiency rests "in the measure of each several part," in the measure, which every part, the individual member of the Church in himself has from Christ. The service rendered proceeds therefore from the individual parts, from each one, so that it is not to be referred merely to the ministry, the officers of the church (Harless). This efficient service of the individuals is to the advantage of the whole and conditions the growth of the whole. Comp. vers. 7, 12. This part of the sentence is therefore to be closely connected with ἐπιχορηγίας, and not joined immediately with αὔξησιν ποιεῖται (Meyer), with which it is connected only through the former.*

Unto the building up of itself in love, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ.—The aim is thus set forth, and as in ver. 12 it is οἰκοδομή; the self-development is here marked, since the powers of growth thereto are given from Christ. This self-edification is consummated only in love, as the life-sphere rendering it possible. "In love" therefore depends grammatically on "edifying" (Bleek), not on "maketh increase" (Meyer).† With this so emphatic conclusion ("unto the building up of itself in love") the Apostle is brought back to his starting-point (ver. 1-3), to the bond of peace.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Christ gives official persons* (ver. 11). It is not so much that Christ established certain regulations binding on the Church, as that He has bestowed on it *persons*, charisms for the endowment of an office, a ministry. He is the Author and Possessor of the office, not only the first, but the only one, who has never relinquished it and never will to the very end. "Christ *gives* the Church's ministers, the Church *takes* those given and sets them in the service of the Church. Accordingly the Church, or he who represents the rights and duties of the Church, never has to choose the subjects arbitrarily, but to know and recognize those endowed by Christ as those given by Him, and to place them in the ministry; hence the highest idea of the ecclesiastical directory is to examine whether those concerned are *given by Christ*, without prejudice however to other requisites which are matters of ecclesiastical polity." Meyer. Concerning the double aspect of the office, which is both *divini* and *humani juris*, a divine institution as well as a human, ecclesiastical arrangement, the passage does not speak more definitely. But three things are plain: 1) It is incorrect to affirm that Christ now raises up no apostolic men, no prophets nor evangelists, but only pastors and teachers. See the *Exeg. Notes*. He does this according to the necessity of the times. 2) It is also erroneous to find no offices at all appointed, and to be unwilling to institute any, as if it were only a human notion to establish a teaching ministry. So the *Quakers* (according to Barclay in Guericke, *Christl. Symbol.* p. 626) and Schenkel, *Ephesians*, p. 66, 5; the former accept only the authority of the Divine endowment of persons, the latter regards the service alone as from the Lord, but the office as a human regulation. 3) Just as little however should these official persons whom the Lord gave at the beginning and still gives to the Church, be fixed in number, as the Irvingites would do, or be stiffened into a hierarchy as among the Roman Catholics.*

2. The *distinction* between the *official persons*, involving as it does no subordination of one class to the other, since indeed the Apostle Matthew is specially designated as Evangelist, John as prophet and Evangelist, while Peter calls himself "presbyter" (1 Pet. v. 1), is altogether irrelevant as respects the teaching office: this individualizes itself in the other offices. Subordination exists only as respects Christ who gives them. They have no reason for self-exaltation on account of their gifts or special calling, nor has the congregation any for aversion to recognize and respect them and their calling: the Lord works with His word and Spirit in them and

* [It is difficult to decide the question of connection. In favor of the view taken by Braune "is the position of the words, and also the congruity of the figure. It is more natural to say that the Divine influence is according to the working of every part—*i. e.*, according to its capacity and function—than to say, 'the growth is according to the working,' *etc.*" (Hodge). Ellicott and Alford connect it with the verb however. The "working" is the functional energy of the body, not Divine inworking, as seems to be indicated by the E. V.: "effectual working."—R.]

† [Meyer's view overloads the verb with qualifications. "Love is just as much the element in which the edification, as that in which the growth takes place" (Alford).—In the hope of giving clearness to the exegesis of this verse, a summary is added: *From whom* (Christ) *all the body* (each and every member) *fitly framed together* (jointed together) *and compacted* (forming one whole) *grows* (as if possessed of life in itself) *by means of every joint* (every special adaptation in gift and office) *of supply* (which Christ grants to these joints as means and instruments, the supply being) *according to the working in the measure of each several part* (Christ's vital energy is serviceable only as supplied by the means He has chosen, and He chooses to supply it as the several parts of the body exercise their functions, so that the growth is not only from Him, but symmetrical and organic also) *unto* (the end being) *the building up of the body itself in love* (as the element of edification).—R.]

* [Eadie: "We are ignorant to a very great extent of the government of the primitive Church, and much that has been written upon it is but surmise and conjecture. The Church represented in the Acts was only in process of development, and there seem to have been differences of organization in various Christian communities, as may be seen by comparing the portion of the Epistle before us with allusions in the three letters to Rome, Corinth and Philippi. Offices seem to be mentioned in one which are not referred to in others. It would appear, in fine, that this last office of government and instruction was distinct in two elements from those previously enumerated; inasmuch as it was the special privilege of each Christian community—not a *ministerium vagum*, and was designed also to be a perpetual institute in the Church of Christ. The Apostle says nothing of the modes of human appointment or ordination to these various offices. He descends not to law, order or form, but his great thought is, that though the ascended Lord gave such gifts to men, yet their variety and number interfere not with the unity of the Church." As this Epistle has for its fundamental thought, "*the Church which is in Christ Jesus*," it is remarkable how the Apostle in it scarcely touches upon those points, which seem to fill the minds of many who profess to hold an exalted estimate of the Church: Nothing about the ministry constituting the Church, though enough to show the necessity for the ministry; nothing about the Church maintaining the succession through fixed forms, but a good deal about Christ's giving real pastors and teachers (the Church sometimes fails to receive such through the most ancient order of succession); nothing about Church polity, but much about the means of her advancement toward unity of faith and knowledge, toward perfection, toward the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.—R.]

through them (Acts xiii. 21; xv. 28), and this arrangement belongs to the living and animating organism of the Church, in which the life of Christ develops itself. The officers should be called neither *clerics* nor *Geistliche*, nor should the Church be divided into *ecclesia repræsentans* and *repræsentata*. For every Christian belongs to the κλῆρος θεοῦ, has a part in the κληρονομία (i. 11, 15), should be "*geistlich*," and have τὸ πνεῦμα, and the ministers as the Lord's servants must labor in and for the Church, to serve her, not to represent *her*, but the Lord.

3. *The task* of the official persons with their gifts for their special calling, over against the other members of the body of Christ with the general call, is "the perfecting of the saints," and this reaches also to "the work of the ministry," to "the edifying of the body of Christ." As certainly then as the servants of the Lord have to serve the Church and its individual members, hence not in the commission of the Church, as though this were always and everywhere the only efficient impulse, nor yet out of their own authority, so certainly should these ministers be prepared for their special service by their labors in the Church, as they have been called and installed by her. As the Lord works upon the Church, and this should permit itself to be acted upon, so she has the duty of working again according to His purpose, of leading back to Him under His guidance and the help of God, which He will grant and furnish for her welfare. The first link in the chain of congregational activity is the officers, the second is every Christian in healthy activity at his post, and thus the joyous upbuilding of the whole is advanced, which reacts on the ministers and individual members of the Church. Thus it goes from above to below, from the ministers in immediate *rapport* with the Lord to the individuals, the Church, the whole, and from individual to individual, and through them to the whole, and from this back again to the individuals. The lay element must be cultivated, set in motion, sustained, animated and guided. The design is to bless men, to serve the people, the people, the people, as LUTHER (1 *Adv. Kirchenpostille*, ed. Franke I. p. 42) preaches. In avoiding the Scylla of priestly rule, many fall into the Charybdis of congregational or lay rule.* This is of importance for all Church polity.

4. Like all *pedagogy*, the pedagogy of the church also should make itself superfluous and unnecessary. The utility of the ecclesiastical office is appointed to this end, and should be managed accordingly.† But this gives neither right nor occasion to undervalue at the time what will and should cease *after* its time. Fidelity to the Master demands that it should be left to Him, when and how He will break up the form, lest we in doing so should spill and lose its contents and substance.

5. In connection with the prospect that we all (ver. 13) shall attain unto the unity of faith and the knowledge of the Son of God, it must be remarked:

(1.) That this is not spoken of in any way (see *Exeg. Notes*) of the *apocatastasis*: "A communion of the enjoyment of salvation" (SCHNECKENBURGER) is not indicated, but the progress from the militant to the triumphant church, the development, not from unbelief to blessedness, not from eternity to God, to heirship with Him, but from faith to sight, from service according to God's will to participation in the glory of His Nature.

(2.) A *uniformity* of expression, of forms and formulas, is not meant, but that condition is meant which the Lord Himself foretells (John x. 16), when there shall be "one fold" and "one Shepherd," when the church of Christ is developed out of and beyond all "fermentation," is ripened, ministers and members furthering each other's advance, the individual parts and the whole in accord, and on the basis of a deeper unity the proper variety existing in glorious harmony.

It cannot be overlooked, that, although the differences, which divide, will *disappear*, because error attaches to them, or at least immaturity, the *removal* of differences cannot be anticipated, unless the church, instead of growing up unto a perfect man, should become an assembly of offensively over-prudent children. Even the distinction of sex shall be removed (Matt. xxii. 30),

* [All questions of Church polity assume an entirely different aspect, when viewed in the light of the voluntary principle, which totally deprives the State of any control in the internal affairs of the Church. There can be no question that the Erastianism prevalent in Germany has done as much to hinder the development of the lay element in Church work in that country, as the opposite principle has to further that development in America. But the latter state of things has its dangers, *e.g.*, incapable Sunday School superintendents and teachers, elders or deacons or church wardens or whatever they may be called, who, while contributing little to the spiritual advancement of the Church, take advantage of their office, or of the influence of their purse in the annual estimates, to control and annoy him whom God gave to be "pastor and teacher."—R.]

† [EADIE: "The meaning (ver. 13) is, that not only is there a blessed point in spiritual advancement set before the church, and that till such a point be gained the Christian ministry will be continued, but also and primarily, that the grand purpose of a continued pastorate in the church is to enable the church to gain a climax which it will certainly reach; for that climax is neither indefinite in its nature nor contingent in its futurity." On the question whether the goal plainly set before the church in ver. 13, is attainable here in this world there is great difference of opinion. That it will first be reached hereafter is held by THEODORET, CALVIN, HODGE and others, and that it is attainable here is affirmed by CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT, JEROME, LUTHER, DE WETTE, MEYER, STIER, SCHENKEL. That πίστις is mentioned does little to decide the matter, nor is there anything to indicate that the distinction of here and hereafter, entered into the Apostle's mind. He regards the church as one, speaks of the goal set before her on the earth, not stating whether it is to be attained on earth (So HARLESS, OLSHAUSEN, EADIE, ELLICOTT). Besides eschatological views do much to give indefiniteness to the terms "here and hereafter" in our use of them. "In such sketches the Apostle holds up an ideal which, by the aim and labor of the Christian pastorate, is partially realized on earth, and ought to be more vividly manifested; but which will be fully developed in heaven, when, the effect being secured, the instrumentality may be dispensed with" (EADIE). That effect has not yet been secured, that instrumentality may not yet be dispensed with: yet those who are tossed as waves, who are carried about by every wind of doctrine, who according to the Apostle show most clearly the present necessity for the ministerial office, are readiest to cry out that it is useless. Would that the *church* needed ministers less! Then they might go out into the world more frequently to win souls for Christ! Paul here certainly does not prophesy of that "church of the future," in which there shall be neither pastor nor teacher, because each member is able to take care of himself, and there is nothing to be held up to "faith." That "Church" in the view of those who proclaim its coming, will be based on "knowledge;" but it will be γνῶσις not ἐπίγνωσις, perception of some fragments of truth, not the grasping and knowing with "faith and knowledge" all Truth, in the Person "of the Son of God."—R.]

as that of corporealness in general; but that is no reason why we should treat the body as a prison of the soul, and desire to be without sex, before we enter the company of the angels. Let each one be faithful to his own church and to his Lord! Beyond Christ we cannot go, without Him or against Him there is no progress.

6. He who allows himself to be determined by external influences, is still immature, is as yet no man, independent, firm and clear, unless these influences come from the source of truth and life, from Christ: from Him and to Him our life comes and goes. Influences of an unchristian character are brought by the spirit of this world into every age, and many a one may unconsciously serve this spirit against the truth; as in the history of the world there is presented a plan of God, so in these there is a method which points beyond them into the kingdom of darkness and lies.

7. Truth and Love, which belong together, since the former has an ethical character, and the latter is not blind, are the fundamental elements of growth, requiring Christ as the aim and spring of our life, the gifts of Christ and the acceptance on the part of the church, her receptivity and self-activity, the reciprocity of the whole and each individual member. By this we may judge the wrong and error of the separate divisions and generations of the church. The Catholics do not let Christ work as a fresh streaming fountain, nor rightly value the life of the members of the church, but put the apostolic power of the Pope with his hierarchy in the front and centre; they undervalue the Head and members and overvalue the ministers of the church, who become masters. The Lutherans have hampered the lay element, and suffer the consequences of the abridgement: the fellowship of the church is too little developed. The Reformed are wanting in the sacramental element; they foster what is individual and social, rather than that which is formative and established, as the sects proceeding from them plainly show.—By this passage every position and every age regulate itself.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Take heed, pastor, that thou not only hast an office and ministry shown to thee, which thou administerest, but that thou art and becomest more and more thyself a gift of Christ to His church.—Rejoice, O church, that the servants of Christ are Christ's gifts for thee and use them according to His will against thy lust and errors.—Thou shouldst not say, that Christ raised up Apostles, prophets, evangelists, only in the first century and never since; nor deny that He raises up the pastors and teachers of His church.—All ministry, even the most important minister is in vain, if he does not labor further into the house and the bye-ways, so that each in his place may do his duty as a Christian; but if the spiritual teachers do their duty, the church will not remain unspiritual.—Do not reckon according to visible results; concealed and gradual is the progress of the work, reaching its mark at last and in glory. But do not think hastily and proudly, now is the time of maturity! You may in the end mistake the impulse of the spirit of the age for the showers of Christ's Spirit and the Shibboleth of party-spirit for the word of life, and this deception would be fearful.—No one is so much a minor as to be without responsibility and strength to resist; have regard to this, proving all things by the truthfulness in love, by Christ, the End and Source of all growth! Preach the word simply and purely! Certainly, but not less: love it in the same way. Love does not, indeed, work by means of injustice, untruth, deception, counterfeiting, intrigue, misrepresentation and pretence. But she creates fellowship, and truth is the cause, not of the isolated individual, but of the fellowship of heaven and earth, of the nations, of the earth, and of centuries, aye of thousands of years.

STARKE: For as rogues so manage dice that they must fall according to their wish, so do schismatics and fanatics act with the sacred Scriptures.—Truth and love must be side by side. True teaching and lovely living. That is the sum of all Christianity. Love and unity edify.

RIEGER: The goal of our growth is a long distance before us, the hindrances are many; but growth is the most certain way thither. For as little as in physical growth is advance made all at once with immoderate rapidity, but as in the use of the ordained means, with proper labor and exercise, in confidence on God and His bestowed blessing, in love and peace with one another, the body grows, not one member only, but one just as another, so we, through God's word, prayer, embracing all the means afforded us in the church, the school and the home, reach the position of men of God furnished for every good work.

HEUBNER: Christ's kingdom embraces even the invisible kingdom of God. Would this be conceivable, if He were a mere man?—The variety of offices should not lead to ambition and place-hunting, but to the service of the church.—The stature of manhood in a Christian consists in this, that he, irrespective of men has spiritual majority and independence. Teachers should not wish to keep the congregation in a state of immaturity, but their task is to render themselves unnecessary.—It is the duty of the Christian to strive after this maturity.—Humanity is capable of an ever-increasing perfection by means of Christianity. Progress in Christianity is, however, no advance beyond Christianity.—The Christian is firm in his faith and free from the miserable dependence on foreign and worldly opinion.—How much is still wanting in the mutual support of all in the Christian church. All should be for the furtherance of the Christian life: for example, the household life should be a school of Christianity, the State should further the church, and the schools of learning educate for Christianity, all arts and sciences should subserve religion.—It is child's play, even when not detrimental, to speculate how far this figure of the body can be carried out into detail, who, for example, is eye, ear, breast, back, *etc.* This can lead to results of as revolting a character, as the Hindoo system of caste.

PASSAVANT: One class, as well as another, is chosen to their particular service by the Master of the church; and He who on earth was in the

form of a servant, will regard the more lowly of His servants with special looks of love. He sees the heart, and fidelity in what is little is precious in His sight.—To seek truth always and everywhere, in all things and among all persons; to act in truth with all, towards all, with one's self and before God; to base one's inmost thoughts and impulses always in and on the truth—this keeps the heart, amid all the lies, lusts and illusions of this false world, firm and quiet, as the ship that has escaped the waves and cast anchor in the harbor.—All genuine truth and love come alone from Christ upon us and into us, leading us back again to Christ.

GERLACH: In every false teaching which separates men from Christ and His word, the Apostle shows us also a work of wickedness. Human nature was not created by God so perverse as to choose without the fault of man, a lie instead of the truth.

ZELLER: These are the instruments by which the Lord has chosen to build His Church, not Popes, not Emperors and kings, not princes and great ones, the mighty monarchs of this world, but Apostles, Evangelists, pastors and teachers, men illuminated by His spirit, endued with power from on high, not merely by men, but given and appointed by Himself. It is to take place through the peaceful means of preaching, pastoral care, instruction.

[EADIE: Ver. 12. The spiritual advancement of the Church, is the ultimate design of the Christian pastorate. The ministry preaches and rules to secure this, which is at the same time the purpose of Him who appointed and who blesses it.—Ver. 13. Christians are all to attain to oneness of faith, that is, all of them shall be filled with the same ennobling and vivifying confidence in this Divine Redeemer—not some leaning more to His humanity, and others showing an equally partial and defective preference for His Divinity—not some regarding Him rather as an instructor and example, and others drawn to Him more as an atonement—not some fixing an exclusive gaze on Christ without them, and others cherishing an intense and one-sided aspiration for Christ within them—but all reposing a united confidence in Him—"the Son of God."—The Christian church is not full grown, but it is advancing to perfect age.—Ver. 14. How many go the rounds of all sects, parties, and creeds, and never receive satisfaction. If in the pride of reason they fall into rationalism, then if they recover, they rebound into mysticism. From the one extreme of legalism they recoil to the farthest verge of antinomianism, having travelled at easy stages all the intermediate distance.—Ver. 15. That character is nearest perfection in which the excessive prominence of no grace throws such a withering shadow upon the rest, as to signalize or perpetuate their defect, but in which all is healthfully balanced in just and delicate adaptation.—Ver. 16. The church is built up, for love is the element of spiritual progress. That love fills the renewed nature, and possesses peculiar facilities of action in edifying the mystical body of Christ. Whatever parts it may have, whatever their forms, uses, and position, whatever the amount of energy resident in them, still, from their connection with the one living Head, and from their own compacted union and mutual adjustment, they compose but one growing structure "in love."—R.]

[HODGE: Ver. 12. If Christ has appointed the ministry for the edification of His body, it is in vain to expect that end to be accomplished in any other way.—Ver. 14. Error can never be harmless, nor false teachers innocent. Two considerations, however, should secure moderation and meekness in applying these principles. The one is, that though error implies sin, orthodoxy does not always imply holiness. The character most offensive to God is that of a malignant zealot for the truth. The other consideration is, that men are often much better than their creed: that is, the doctrines on which they live are much nearer the truth than those which they profess. They deceive themselves by attaching wrong meaning to words, and seem to reject truth, when in fact they only reject their own misconceptions.—Ver. 16. The church is Christ's body. The body grows. Concerning this growth, the Apostle says: 1. It is from Him. He is the causal source from whom all life and power are derived. 2. It depends on the intimate union of all the parts of the body with the Head, by means of appropriate bands. 3. It is symmetrical. 4. It is a growth in love.—R.]

---

3. General Christian Duties.

CHAP. IV. 17—V. 21.

a. The principle of the new walk, with reference to the contrast of the old and the new men.

CHAP. IV. 17-24.

17 This I say therefore [therefore I say], and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth
walk not [no longer walk] as other Gentiles [the rest of the Gentiles][1] walk, in the
18 vanity of their mind. Having the understanding darkened [Being darkened[2] in
their understanding], being alienated from the life of God [,] through [because of]
the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness [hardness] of the heart:
19 Who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness [to wanton-

20 ness], to work all uncleanness with [in] greediness. But ye have not so learned
21 [did not so learn] Christ; If so be that ye have heard [If indeed ye heard] him,
and have been [were] taught by [in] him, as the truth is [as is truth][3] in Jesus:
22 That ye put off concerning the former conversation [as regards your former way of
life] the old man, which is [waxeth] corrupt according to the deceitful lusts [lusts
23 of deceit]; And be [become] renewed in the spirit [or by the Spirit][4] of your mind;
24 And that ye put on the new man, which after God is [hath been] created in righteousness and true holiness [holiness[5] of the truth].

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 17.—[The reading is doubtful: ℵ.[3] D.[2 3] E. K. L., most cursives, Syriac, Chrysostom (*Rec.*, Tischendorf, Meyer, Eadie, Braune), sustain λοιπά; it is wanting in ℵ.[1] B. D.[1] F. G., 5 cursives, Vulgate and other versions, and rejected by Lachmann, Alford, Ellicott. The external evidence against it is slightly preponderating, but internal grounds are in its favor. It was probably misunderstood, and the omission further confirmed by 1 Thess. iv. 5.—R.]

[2] Ver. 18.—[ℵ. A. B.: ἐσκοτωμένοι, which, as more rare, is preferred by most recent editors to ἐσκοτισμένοι (*Rec.*, D. F. K. L.). The comma after "God," is required by the view taken of the construction as a parallelism:

a Being darkened in their understanding,
b Being alienated from the life of God,
a Because of the ignorance that is in them,
b Because of the hardness of their heart.

The first and third, second and fourth members correspond, the alternation being probably due to the reciprocal interaction which is also implied.—R.]

[3] Ver. 21.—[This rendering is literal, see *Exeg. Notes*.—The aorists in vers. 20, 21 are best rendered by the English past tense.—*In* is substituted for *by*, as is so often necessary.—R.]

[4] Ver. 23.—[The two leading interpretations are suggested by the two readings given above. See *Exeg. Notes*.—*Become renewed* is adopted (from Ellicott) to indicate the force of the present, which here marks a continuing process.—R.]

[5] Ver. 24.—[ℵ.[1] gives: ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ.—The hendiadys of the E. V. here (and at the close of ver. 22: "deceitful lusts") must be guarded against.—*Hath been created* is preferable here to *was created*, for though the Greek aorist is historical, the latter rendering "tends to throw the κτίσις further back than is actually intended; the reference being to the new κτίσις in Christ" (Ellicott).—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 17 *a*. *The connection.* **This therefore I say** [τοῦτο οὖν λέγω].—Τοῦτο refers to what follows, and with emphasis (WINER, p. 152); οὖν, however, as the subsequent context shows, going back of the digression (iv. 4-16), which contains the motives of the exhortation (iv. 1-3), refers to "walk worthy." THEODORET: πάλιν ἀνέλαβε τῆς παραινέσεως τὸ προοίμιον.* But the simple "I say" is not enough for the Apostle; he adds: **And testify in the Lord,** καὶ μαρτύρομαι ἐν κυρίῳ.—He presents himself in his apostolic authority as a witness, not in his own, but in the Lord's cause. ["By thus sinking his own personality, the Apostle greatly enhances the solemnity of his declaration" (ELLICOTT).—R.] It is similar to Rom. ix. 1; 1 Thess. iv. 1. The Lord is the element in which he lives and in this case bears witness, and at the same time the ground on which he stands in common with the Ephesians; on this account he reckons on their acceptance of his urgent appeal. It is not=πρὸς κυρίου, *per Dominum* (even the *Greek Fathers*, and many others).

The heathen walk as a type of the natural walk in general; Vers. 17 *b*-19.

Ver. 17 *b*. **That ye no longer walk** [μηκέτι ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν.—This infinitive is the object of λέγω (it being unnecessary to understand δεῖν) expressing, however, what ought to be (EADIE) more than what is; ELLICOTT thinks an imperative sense involved ("that ye no longer *must* walk"), as indeed the context indicates (ALFORD).—R.] This says negatively what is expressed positively in ver. 1: "walk worthy." "No longer" denotes their once walking, as they should not and dare not now, being Christians.—**As the rest of the Gentiles walk.**—[See *Textual Note* [1]] Καθώς introduces the kind of walk which they should avoid. Καί is joined with emphasis and admonitory force to τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη to which class they belong.* The heathen are those who remained behind, they no longer belong to the heathen who now "walk," and how?

In the vanity of their mind, ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν.—This is the briefest characterization of the natural heathen walk, presenting both its religious and moral side. It is the explanation of THEODORET (τὰ μὴ ὄντα θεοποιεῖν) in accordance with Rom. i. 21; viii. 20; 1 Pet. i. 18. This "vanity" [betokening a *waste* of the whole rational powers on worthless objects (ALFORD).—R.] is, of course, one brought about through sin, another nature as it were. It has penetrated even the will of the human spirit, corrupting this high faculty, the ἡγεμονικόν in the nature of man.† Hence there is no special reference to philosophy (GROTIUS). To this general sketch are added *special* traits in vers. 18, 19.

Ver. 18. **Being darkened in their understanding,** ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ ὄντες.—The masculine form indicates the reference to persons, to particular individuals, and not to the whole, τὰ ἔθνη, as such. The verb (σκοτόω), only here and Rev. xvi. 10, instead of the more usual σκοτίζω, is in the perfect, to denote a state not

* [The οὖν is resumptive rather than illative, but as ALFORD says: "The digression is all in the course of the argument. The fervid style of St. Paul will never divide sharply into separate logical portions—each runs into and overlaps the other." EADIE defends the connection with what immediately precedes.—R.]

* [If λοιπά be rejected, there is still an allusion in καί to the fact that they were once thus walking, *i. e.*, were once Gentiles. The only point of difference is, that the fuller reading implies they are so still. "Though the Ephesians did not walk so now, their returning to such a course is made the logical hypothesis" (ALFORD).—R.]

† [So EADIE and most; HODGE however takes νοῦς as the whole soul, just as on the other hand in Rom. vii. 23–25, he refers it to the renewed nature, in both cases sacrificing exactness to doctrinal considerations.—R.]

previously existing, but having come into being, which the present participle, (ὄ ν τ ε ς) designates as present. That to which the darkness clings is set forth by τῇ δ ι α ν ο ί ᾳ,* which means the intellectual power of the mind, the mode of thought, the character, since the reference is not to the formal faculty, but to its condition. Comp. Rom. i. 21 f.; xi. 10. It is incorrect to join ὄ ν τ ε ς with what follows (RUECKERT) [EADIE]; it follows thus in Tit. i. 16 also, and τῇ δ ι α ν ο ί ᾳ forms one conception, together with the participle in its emphatic position.

Being alienated from the life of God, ἀ π η λ λ ο τ ρ ι ω μ έ ν ο ι τ ῆ ς ζ ω ῆ ς τ ο ῦ θ ε ο ῦ.—See on ii. 12: "alienated from the commonwealth of Israel." The perfect participle must be noted here also; BENGEL correctly remarking: *participia præsupponunt, gentes ante defectionem suam a fide patrum—fuisse participes lucis et vitæ. Conf. renovari ver.* 23.—Ζ ω ή, the opposite of θάνατος (ii. 1), is the intensive spiritual, eternal life, belonging to God (τ ο ῦ θ ε ο ῦ), *vita, quæ accenditur ex ipsa Dei vita* (BENGEL), *qua Deus vivit in suis* (BEZA), *vera vita, qui est Deus* (ERASMUS); LUTHER: the life, that is out of God. [Comp. TRENCH, *Syn.* § xxviii.; OLSHAUSEN, STIER *in loco*.—R.] See WINER, p. 175. Thus "the vanity of their mind" is designated as to its two sides, the ethically intelligent, and the ethically practical. [This clause sets forth an "objective result of the subjective 'being darkened'" (ALFORD).—R.] To this corresponds what is immediately added.

Because of the ignorance that is in them, because of the hardness of their heart, δ ι ὰ τ ὴ ν ἄ γ ν ο ι α ν τ ὴ ν ο ὖ σ α ν ἐ ν α ὐ τ ο ῖ ς, δ ι ὰ τ ὴ ν π ώ ρ ω σ ι ν† τ ῆ ς κ α ρ δ ί α ς α ὐ τ ῶ ν.—These two clauses are added without a connecting particle, because they refer to the two preceding ones, as their purport requires, and because the one requires and furthers the other. "Because of the ignorance that is in them," points to an ignorance which has become immanent, is now natural and peculiar (Acts iii. 17; xvii. 30; 1 Pet. i. 14), as the ground (διὰ with the accus., see WINER, p. 372) of the darkening, and which is ever increasing, going from ignorance to ignorance. "Because of the hardness of their heart," renders prominent in the same way the hardness, unsusceptibility of the heart as the ground of the estrangement from the life of God. The two are ever conjoined in the natural man: There is not intellectual obscuration *beside* practical estrangement from God, nor ignorance *beside* hardness of heart; the one conditions the other, working destructively as they reciprocally affect each other. Hence it cannot be affirmed, that the former applies more to the Gentiles, the latter to the Jews (STIER and others); the Gentiles alone are spoken of, as a type of the natural character. But at the same time the "ignorance" is not to be regarded as merely a *consequence*, and these two clauses (with διά) referred to the last participial clause alone (MEYER).

[This parallelism of construction in which the first and third, second and fourth clauses are connected together is accepted, by BENGEL, DE WETTE, OLSHAUSEN, FORBES (*Symmetrical structure of Scripture*, p. 21), SCHENKEL and others. It is opposed by MEYER, HODGE, EADIE and ELLICOTT; but the objection they urge, that "ignorance" is not the cause of "darkness," loses its force when it is remembered that the Apostle is speaking of a *process* rather than a *condition.* Nor is it contrary to the Apostle's style, in which parallelisms abound, far less so than to explain: "Darkness of mind is the cause of ignorance, ignorance and consequent obduracy of heart are the cause of alienation from God" (HODGE), thus trajecting the third and fourth clauses between the first and second. This is the view of MEYER, who makes the last clause subordinate to the third (though both are introduced by διά): a needless complication, which leads to the removal of the comma, while the view of Braune requires the insertion of one after θ ε ο ῦ. See *Textual Note* [2].—R.]

Ver. 19. **Who,** ο ἵ τ ι ν ε ς [*men who, such as*], introduces the explanation, the proof of this condition.—**Being past feeling have given themselves over** [ἀ π η λ γ η κ ό τ ε ς ἑ α υ τ ο ὺ ς π α ρ έ δ ω κ α ν]. — Ἀ π η λ γ η κ ό τ ε ς (from ἀπὸ and ἄλγος, ἀλγέω), unsusceptible of pain, and according to the context, in the heart, the moral consciousness, hence not feeling the unrest and punishment of conscience, the correction of God (Jer. v. 3), they have given themselves over, *ultro* (BENGEL); that is the ἀναισθησία, *sponte sese in gurgitem omnium vitiorum præcipitans.* CALVIN: *Homines a Deo relicti, sopita conscientia, exstincto divini judicii timore, amisso denique sensu tanquam attoniti, belluino impetu se ad omnem turpitudinem projiciunt.* [The pronoun ἑ α υ τ ο ύ ς is used "with terrible emphasis" (MEYER).—R.] Self-reprobation is consummated in becoming apathetic, just as Rom. i. 24: "God delivered them over, in the lusts of their hearts." Our passage marks the freedom and guilt of men, the passage in Romans the rule, will and power of God, but both of them indicate the means: the lust corrupting even unto want of feeling; here prominence is given to the consequence, the condition which has arisen and becomes aggravated (ἀ π η λ γ η κ ό τ ε ς),* there to the ground, the active power ("lusts").

To wantonness, τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ.—The term, apparently from θέλγω, *schwelgen* [allied to the English *swell*, and meaning to over-eat, carouse, debauch], occurs quite frequently (Mark vii. 22; Rom. xiii. 13; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Gal. v. 19; 1 Pet. iv. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 2, 7, 18; Jude 4), almost always in connection with sensual sins, denoting, however, not special sin, but reckless, unbridled, extravagant and excessive character in general.

---

* [This is a dative of reference, giving the sphere or element in which. On the difference between it and the accusative it may be said that the latter is more objective, denoting that the darkness extended over the mind, the former more subjective, denoting that it has its seat in the mind. The word itself is here=the understanding (*Verstand*).—R.]

† [On the etymology and meaning of πώρωσις. See FRITZCHE, *Rom.* xi. 7. It undoubtedly means *hardness, obduracy* (not blindness), used by medical writers of the "*callus*" at the extremity of fractured bones.—R.]

* [Some textual variations occur, but not sufficiently supported to raise any question. From ἀπηλπικότες (D. and others) the sense *desperantes* seems to have come. But it is incorrect; the semi-technical term πώρωσις suggests a continuation of the figure.—R.]

Comp. TITTMANN, I., p. 150 ff., on ἀσέλγεια and ἀκαθαρσία, [TRENCH, ¿ xvi., and *Exeg. Notes* on Gal. v. 19, in this volume.—R.] It is not to be limited to sensual lasciviousness (MEYER).

To work all uncleanness, *εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης*.—[The preposition introduces the conscious aim of this self-abandonment.—R.] Ἐργασία marks the managing, the assiduous, connected labor [the working at it as though it were a trade], and ἀκαθαρσία, extended by πάσης,* sets forth what has come to pass in the service of ἀσέλγεια. We should apply it to all kinds of uncleanness, especially libidinous, but also to the lust of the eye and pride, natural and unnatural, refined and coarse, solitary and social, in thought, word and deed (Rom. i. 24–32). Still less is this to be limited to libidinous filthiness (MEYER), or to trade in harlotry, *quæstus ex impudicitia* (GROTIUS, BENGEL and others). The next phrase will not justify this.

In greediness, *ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ*.—This word means to want to have more, greediness, avarice, graspingness, limited usually to earthly possession, to money (v. 3; Col. iii. 5; Mark vii. 22; Luke xii. 15); but the limitation arises from the context, not from the word itself. The context here does not admit of any such limitation: ἐν, in, marks the ground on which the "uncleanness" moves, and this is not avarice, but greed in general unto insatiableness. Hence the GREEK FATHERS thus explain it (CHRYSOSTOM: ἀμέτρως, THEODORET: ἀμετρία, ŒCUMENIUS: καθ' ὑπερβολὴν καὶ ἀνενδότως). Ἐν is not=σύν (LUTHER: together with avarice); there is not a new special vice, avarice, added to another special one, unchastity (MEYER, SCHENKEL); neither the context nor the word itself favors the explanation: gluttony (HARLESS).†

Reminder respecting Christ and Christian instruction; vers. 20, 21.

Ver. 20. **But ye,** *ὑμεῖς δέ*, in opposition to "the rest of the Gentiles" [just described].—**Did not so learn Christ.**—Οὐχ οὕτως is a very emphatic litotes=entirely otherwise, not at all in such a way that you can live afterwards as you did before. Ἐμάθετε [the historical aorist] τὸν Χριστόν marks Christ as the object, the substance of the preaching of the Apostles and of Christ Himself; His person we must attain to; He Himself must be accepted and appropriated in us (vers. 13, 15; Col. ii. 6; 1 Cor. i. 23; 2 Cor. i. 19). Hence it is not=the doctrine of Christ, as was once almost generally thought. [This use of the verb with an accusative of the person is probably unique (ELLICOTT), and properly so, for in no other learning is a Person so directly and fully the object. Hence the explanation: learnt to know, is inadmissible as without lexical authority and insufficient. BEZA's exegesis is totally unwarranted: "Ye are not so—ye have learned Christ."—R.]

*[The unusual position of πάσης leads ELLICOTT to render: "uncleanness of every kind."—R.]

† [HODGE renders: "together with covetousness," which is doubly objectionable. The wider sense of πλεονεξία is accepted by EADIE, ALFORD and ELLICOTT. The last named, however, properly objects to obliterating the underlying notion of *covetousness* and *self-seeking* which seems bound up in the word. Comp. Col. iii. 5, p. 64; and TRENCH, *Syn.* ¿ xxiv., who links it most closely with sins of lust.—R.]

Ver. 21. **If indeed ye heard him** [*εἴγε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε*]—Εἴγε, as in iii. 2, marks in a fine turn of expression a definite, undoubted fact ("that he heard him"), *particula non minuit, sed auget vim admonitionis* (BENGEL). It is not however="so as" (STIER). Αὐτόν is in emphatic position; "heard" denotes the beginning of the discipleship; hence it is not merely, heard *of* Him (LUTHER), but heard Him Himself in spirit, even though through the instrumentality of others. He is the subject of the very first instruction. Hence Paul adds:

And were taught in him, *καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε*.—The two designations* correspond to those in Matt. xxviii. 19, 20: "disciple all nations"—"teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." "In," ἐν, is neither=περί, *concerning* (PISCATOR), nor ὑπό (FLATT), nor *διά, by* (BEZA) [E. V.], nor *illius nomine, quod ad illum attinet* (BENGEL), but an instruction not merely having its result, a being or living in Him, but in accordance with the fellowship with Him (WINER, p. 366); *in ipso= ipsi insiti* and *docti* are equivalent (BUCER); *doceri* is *inseri*.

As is the truth in Jesus [*καθώς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ*].—"As" refers only to the instruction, to its quality; it corresponds to "not so" (ver. 20); what was there negatively and briefly indicated, is here positively expressed, and then given in detail.† "Is truth" gives prominence to the agreement of the teaching with the reality: in the instruction they hear Him really, possess Him as He is. Ἐστιν, coming first, denotes the existence, the reality, and that, too, as a present, now valid and continuing reality.

Consequens τοῦ audire et τοῦ doceri est τὸ discere (BENGEL): they have therefore learned, as truth is in Him. "Truth" is here opposed to the heathen "vanity;" as the latter was a self-made foundling, the former is something bestowed, real, excluding the subtleties of human origin or change of any kind. [The notion of the Greek adjective ἀληθινός is thus included by Dr. Braune. The clause setting forth the *manner* of the instruction (the substance follows in vers. 22–24), may be thus explained: If ye were taught so that what you received was according to what is true (true and real) as embodied in a personal Saviour. The literal rendering: "as is truth in Jesus" gives most nearly the exact force.—R.] In the expression ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, the article is significant, pointing to the known Person, the personal name being chosen instead of the official title, Christ. BENGEL: *Expressius ponit nomen* Ἰησοῦ. CHRISTI, *ideam perfectissime et fulgidissime explevit* JESUS; this preserves the received instruction from obliteration. — The clause is, therefore, not parenthetical (BEZA, RUECKERT and others), "truth" is neither

* [ALFORD renders: "If, that is, it was Him that ye heard and in Him that ye were taught," following MEYER in regarding both as included in "ye learned Christ," the first clause referring to the first reception, the second to further instruction. So ELLICOTT. Perhaps ALFORD restricts the meaning too much when he explains "heard Him," "if ye really heard at your conversion the voice of the Shepherd Himself calling you as His sheep."—R.]

† [This view properly excludes the interpretation "inasmuch," which Dr. HODGE here, as elsewhere, attaches to καθώς.—R.]

agnitio Dei (BENGEL), nor *true doctrine* of Christ (PISCATOR and others), nor true holiness, goodness (ERASMUS, HARLESS [HODGE] and others). We should not connect "in Jesus" with what follows (HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, II., 2, p. 291).

The Christian walk; vers. 22–24, *a.* Negative side; ver. 22, *b.* Positive side; vers. 23, 24.

Ver. 22. **That ye put off,** ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς.—This infinitive depends grammatically on the entire thought, that they heard Him and were taught in Him, as the truth in Jesus is (BLEEK), although STIER and BENGEL are not incorrect in connecting it in sense with "I say and testify" (ver. 17); they recognise, however, "a certain reference to the nearest words" (ver. 21). The emphasis rests on the verb, coming first, which has its antithesis in "put on" (ver. 24). It is incorrect to accept a dependence on the last clause alone (MEYER) and a contrast between "Jesus" and "ye" (JEROME, HARLESS, and others), which would be indicated by an emphatic position for ὑμᾶς and the insertion of οὕτως.* In the frequently occurring figures of putting on and off the clothes to represent the external appearance from which the internal state may be inferred, it is not necessary to find an allusion to a race before which, or a baptism (of a proselyte) at which the clothes should be taken off; the context gives no warrant for either. The Lord Himself (Luke xxiv. 49) transferred into the New Testament the usage of the Old Testament in describing an instantaneous, sudden inspiration. Comp. STIER, *Words of Jesus*, vii. p. 323 f. Paul extended the figure (ver. 25; vi. 11, 14; Rom. xiii. 12, 13; Col. iii. 8, 9, 10; 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; Gal. iii. 27; 1 Thess. v. 8). The verb includes the sense of a decided casting away, not merely a gentle putting off, since this is required of the followers of Jesus, among whom a preserving of the old man and the heathen walk is intolerable.

As regards your former way of life [κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφήν].—Κατά introduces that with respect to which the putting off takes place. The substantive (ἀναστροφή), like the verb, includes a course of conduct arising from a corresponding disposition, the manifestation of what is within, as Gal. i. 13; 1 Pet. ii. 11, 12; i. 17, 18 (STIER), and is more than περιπατεῖν, preparing the way for the mention of the internal disposition which should be put off. It is not enough to put off merely the former heathen (προτέραν) walk.† *Antitheton versus 23 totus* (BENGEL).

The old man [τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον].—"Man" denotes here the Ego (ἐγώ, Rom. vii. 9, 10; 17-21). "Old" designates that it is condemned to be put away, old over against Jesus the second Adam; hence "the old man" (Col. iii. 9; Rom. vi. 6) means the sinful Ego deranged by sin, the natural man in the corruption of his sin.* This condition is then described:

Which waxeth corrupt according to the lusts of deceit [τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης].—The present participle denotes the present condition, which is not however a purely passive one: "which is corrupted," but in accordance with ver. 19: "which corrupts himself." It is then neither imperfect: which corrupted himself (BENGEL), nor to be taken as referring to the future judgment (RUECKERT and others); yet it is not merely=morally destroying himself (HARLESS). The antithesis is *creatum* (BENGEL) and the use of φθορά and φθείρεσθαι (Gal. vi. 8; Rom. viii. 20, 21) points to the whole man, body and soul. [MEYER and HODGE refer it to eternal destruction: "which tends to destruction," but this does not do justice to the present participle, the peculiar force of which, as indicating a process not entirely passive, is brought out by "waxeth corrupt" (ELLICOTT). HODGE's objection, that "old" already expresses the idea of corruption, has no force against this description of the *progressive* character, while his own view introduces an objective element into a delineation which is strictly subjective.—R.]

The accomplishment of the corruption is more closely defined by the phrase: "according to the lusts of deceit," The corruption is accomplished in accordance with the lusts, the factors of the corruption; and these are affairs of sin, which are here personified in accordance with the power of deceiving and betraying inherent in it (Rom. vii. 11; 1 Cor. xi. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 9). The genitive, which is that of the *subject*, is not to be resolved into an adjective (GROTIUS [E. V.]) and thus weakened, nor applied merely to *error technicus* (BENGEL). The antithesis is *secundum Deum—in justitia et sanctitate veritatis* (BENGEL).

Ver. 23. **And become renewed** [ἀνανεοῦσθαι δέ].—The contrast is marked by δέ, which introduces the *positive* side (vers. 23, 24), The verb in the passive† points to the fact that a work and operation of God is spoken of (ii. 10; iv. 24; κτισθέντα; see Tit. iii. 5, 2 Tim. i. 9). The present refers to an operation which is not concluded in a moment, but continues. The roots of the word (νέος [*recent*], *new*) points to a becoming rejuvenated, to the beginning, the coming into being, of what was not, or not yet, or no longer; καινός [*novus*] refers to the character of that which exists, as compared with its

*[MEYER insists that ὑμᾶς forbids the dependence on ἐδιδάχθητε, but ELLICOTT suggests that it marks a contrast, not with "Jesus," but with the "Gentiles" and their own previous condition as implied in the next phrase. The infinitive has, not in itself, but from its independence, an imperative force, as in "walk" (ver. 1): "that ye must put off." As an aorist it probably refers to the speedy and single nature of the act. The dependence on the entire preceding thought is a satisfactory solution: The substance of what you heard, were taught, when you heard Him and were taught in Him in the correct way "as is truth in Jesus," was "to put off," "that you must put off," etc.—R.]

†[ALFORD thus indicates the train of thought: "for you were clothed with it (the old man) in your former conversation." The phrase qualified the verb, not the substantive: "That as regards your former way of life you put off."—R.]

*[The reader is referred to *Romans*, p. 203; comp. pp. 235–244. The opinions there advocated are expressed in ELLICOTT'S notes on "the old man:" "personification of our whole sinful condition before regeneration, opposed to the καινος or νέος ἄνθρωπος (ver. 24; Col. iii. 10) and the καινὴ κτίσις (Gal. vi. 15), or, if regarded in another point of view to the ἔσω ἄνθρωπος (iii. 16; Rom. vii. 22)."—R.]

†[The middle form of the verb is active in meaning (HARLESS), so that we must insist on the *passive* here. STIER objects that "to be renewed" is not a proper subject of exhortation. But the Apostle is giving the substance of the teaching (ver. 21), and as ALFORD well remarks: "we have perpetually this seeming paradox of *God's work* encouraged or checked by man's co-operation or counter-action." He renders: "undergo renewal."—R.]

former *condition;* ἀνακαινοῦν is to put away the ruins of the present condition and to supply new powers, to transfer into a condition of newness, as distinguished from the previous one. Hence we never find νέα κτίσις, but καινή, since νεότης is already implied in κτίσις. See TITTMANN, *Syn.* I. p. 60 f. [TRENCH, *Syn.* (§ xviii.; *Colossians*, p. 65,) ALFORD and HODGE *in loco.*—R.] 'Ανά indicates not merely a setting up, but according to the participles in vers. 18, 19, a restitution of the original creation. The infinitive is in the same dependence as ἀποθέσθαι, although in these infinitives there is latent, a hortatory imperative, which comes out in ver. 25. Still this inheres in the thought, not in the form.

In the Spirit [or by the Spirit] of your mind [τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν].—The renewal, the letting themselves be renewed, is accomplished in this. The dative is one of reference, the genitive that of the subject. HARLESS says: ψυχή designates the immediateness of the personal life, καρδία the same as the internal life of a human person, νοῦς is the *habitus* corresponding to this existence and life, πνεῦμα the motive power which calls forth and conditions this *habitus.* To this the organism of the human spirit corresponds. BENGEL: *spiritu mentis*, 1 Cor. xiv. 14. *Spiritus est intimum mentis.* That *inexplicabile* coming from God (OETINGER) must be renewed, is seized by the corruption of sin, needs redemption from "the vanity of the mind." We may not take πνεύματι as instrumental on account of the genitive and understand it of the Holy Spirit (OEKUMEN, and others), nor can both explanations be combined (STIER: through the Spirit yet living in you); in that case the middle, contrary to the usage which gives it an active sense, and contrary to the Biblical view, which never speaks of men renewing themselves, is taken as reflexive. Nor is the "spirit" of man to be regarded as opposed absolutely to the "flesh," as if it could never be subject to the latter (SCHENKEL).

[The view of Braune, which takes τῷ πνεύματι as a dative of reference referring exclusively to the human spirit, is accepted by most commentators. HODGE takes πνεῦμα here as the "interior life—that of which the νοῦς, καρδία, ψυχή are the modes of manifestation,"—a psychological statement inferior to that of HARLESS, and probably resulting from the desire to avoid any *trichotomic* opinion.—MEYER has wavered in his views: adopting in the 1st, 3d and 4th eds. the usual opinion, and in the second that of FRITZSCHE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT and others. This takes the dative as *instrumental*, and as referring to the human spirit acted upon by the Holy Spirit (see *Romans*, p. 235), or to the Holy Spirit in a gracious union with the human spirit (ELLICOTT, 3d ed.). To this view I incline, but not decidedly. The other interpretation is open to objections both of an exegetical and psychological nature. This sense of πνεῦμα is now clearly established, and indispensable in exegesis. In fact as ALFORD says: "the πνεῦμα of man is only then used '*sensu proprio*' as worthy of its place and governing functions, when it is one Spirit with the Lord." The trouble is, that this πνεῦμα would hardly be spoken of as the instrument; the answer being that a *process* is described as going on, the agent being "the restored and Divinely informed leading principle of their νοῦς."—The genitive is then *possessive.* —R.]

Ver. 24. **And that ye put on,** καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι, is an internal act done by us, having an effect upon the walk and thus manifesting itself. —**The new man,** τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, we have as present, given, outside of ourselves, in Christ; hence Rom. xiii. 14: "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ."

Who after God hath been* created [τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα].—This marks both the reality and the character of the new man. The designation evidently points to Gen. i. 26, 27; which is even more prominent in the parallel passage, Col. iii. 10 ("after the image of Him that created"). Comp. 1 Pet. i. 15. It should be noticed that this qualification compels us not to take "new man" as exactly= Christ; for He is not "created," but rather "God, the image of Him who creates," after whom (κατά) the new man is created. Hence we should refer it to the new human personality as respects Christ, which the Christian should become. Thus in the Epistle to the Colossians we find: τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινόμενον, the young, tender, newly born, which is renewed, developed in contrast with the previous one. The creation of the protoplast is however merely recalled; the expressions are borrowed from it, to designate the new creation taking place in Christ and to put it in relation to the first.†

In righteousness and holiness of the truth [ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας].—This characterizes the new man and sets forth the distinguishing marks of its character; the preposition adjoining to "created" that *in* which the created man appears, with which he is endowed, equipped. The Apostle proceeds from without to within. The two notions are united together and applied to God (Rev. xvi. 5), to men (1 Thess. ii. 10; Tit. i. 1; Luke i. 75), ὅσιος is predicated of God (Rev. xv. 4), of Christ (Heb. vii. 26; Acts ii. 27; xiii. 35), of men (1 Tim. ii. 8). 'Οσιότης refers to the inmost nature, the disposition, the immaculate purity of love (i. 4; v. 27; Heb. vii. 26), δικαιοσύνη to the action and mode of dealing, which keeps all relations within the bounds of truth and right (STIER). TITTMANN, *Syn.* I. 25 ff. Here we may not apply the frequent usage of Plato, who joins both notions, of which Philo says: ὁσιότης μὲν πρὸς θεόν, δικαιοσύνη δὲ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους θεωρεῖται. MEYER regards δικαιοσύνη as moral rectitude in itself, ὁσιότης specially in reference to God. SCHENKEL takes the former as respecting the *world*, the latter *God;* the latter is evidently op-

*["Not created in the case of each individual believer, but created once for all (*initio rei Christianæ*, Bengel) and then individually assumed" (ELLICOTT). Comp. *Textual Note* [6]. —R.]

†["The doctrine of the restoration to us of the Divine image in Christ, as here implied, is not to be overlooked. MUELLER, *Lehre von der Sünde*, ii. p. 485 ff., denies any allusion to it here, but on insufficient grounds, as indeed he himself virtually allows. Not the bare fact of Gen. i. 27, but the great truth which that fact represents is alluded to. The image of God in Christ is a far more glorious thing than Adam ever had, or could have had: but still the κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ=κατὰ θεόν, is true of both" (ALFORD). Comp. *Colossians*, p. 68.—R.]

posed to "uncleanness" (ver. 19) and the former to "wantonness" and "greediness." [So STIER and ELLICOTT.] The genitive sets forth the ground of both; "the truth" is personified, like "love" (ver. 22), the cause of the righteousness and holiness; out of the eternal Divine basis of truth springs the ethical personal life, which is conditioned by this as true: without this man would lapse into "vanity" (ver. 17). LUTHER incorrectly renders the genitive by an adjective: in real righteousness and holiness. [So CALVIN, BEZA, HOLZHAUSEN and the E. V., while PELAGIUS explains: "in the truth," καὶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ (the reading of D. F. and some fathers). There seems to be an antithesis between "truth" here and "deceit" in ver. 22 (HODGE, EADIE and others), which suggests that the notion "real" is prominent here.—R.] It is incorrect to take the preposition as instrumental (MORUS), or as = εἰς. The new man is not created by this ethical quality but by God, nor is this the end, but the accompanying gift of this creation, as is manifest in Christ, to whom this belonged from the beginning, not becoming His in the course of His life.

[OLSHAUSEN's remarks are generally accepted: "Δικαιοσύνη betokens a just relation among the powers of the soul within, and towards men and duties without. But ὁσιότης, like the Hebrew תָּמִים, betokens the integrity of the spiritual life, and the piety towards God of which that is the condition. Hence both expressions together complete the moral idea of perfection. As here the *ethical side* of the Divine image is brought out, Col. iii. 10 brings out the *intellectual*. The new birth alone leads to ἐπίγνωσις: all knowledge which proceeds not from renewal of heart, is but outward appearance; and of this kind was that among the false Colossian teachers. On the other hand, in Wisdom ii. 23 the *physical* side of the Divine image is brought out." ELLICOTT deems the last reference somewhat doubtful.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The nature of the heathen life* is "vanity of the mind." This designates the *type* of the natural character among Jews and Christians. ["The ethical and religious element of their life was unsatisfactory and cheerless, alike in worship and in practice, the same as to present happiness as to future prospect, for they knew not man's chief end" (EADIE).—R.]

2. The "vanity of the mind" is the result of a fall from a previous possession and enjoyment of original gifts, which is accomplished in a twofold series of acts reciprocally requiring and furthering each other; the intellectual and moral side of man's nature being in turn solicited, and thus roused in selfishness, it is ever further removed from the truth in God and from the God of truth. Indeed, the result, the vanity of the mind, is itself capable of increase and must develop into extreme corruption, if aid does not come and a retrograde movement begin.

3. *The intellectual and moral side* of man require and promote each other. The Reason cannot remain healthy and clear, or susceptible, as from the beginning, if the will is or becomes warped or weakened. The obscuration, weakening of the Reason necessarily enters with the enfeebling and confusion of the will. The Apostle comprises both under the term πνεῦμα* (ver. 23); the former he designates νοῦς (vers. 17, 23), διάνοια (ver. 18); the latter καρδία (ver. 18). The Apostle Paul places the initiative in the lusts (ver. 22: "corrupted according to the lusts of deceit"), as Luther sharply indicates in his incorrect translation (which corrupts itself through lusts in error). The perverted will, executing what is wrong, makes the understanding a sophistical attorney, a crafty counsellor for its unrighteousness.

4. *The factors of corruption* are three: *God*, who hardens (Exod. iv. 21; vii. 3; xiv. 4, 8; Jno. xii. 40; Rom. ix. 18; i. 24), *man* himself (1 Sam. vi. 6; Ps. xcv. 8; Heb. iii. 8), the *surrounding circumstances*, through which and under which it takes place (Gen. vii. 13; viii. 15; Heb. iii. 13). According to the context man is here described as the cause of the corruption (ver. 19), because personal guilt and the evoking of self-activity is treated of, while in Rom. i. 24 God is termed the Author in the same matter, since there the final and deepest ground is touched upon. Usually its consummation appears as a history, which is pragmatically sketched by the external circumstances, the Power above the man and the concealed doings within him not being brought into prominence. What comes to pass is never loosed from the dealings of God and His holy rule, nor from the consent and opposition of man or without the influences of historical circumstances and persons. Consider, however, that thy guilt is at once God's punishment and thine own guilt, and forget not that the two appear together as a developing history.

5. *The dangerous element* of sin is the deceit of lust, which plays the role of pleasure, and is not really ἡδονή, but φθορά and φθείρει. This is God's appointment, that what is unholy should be unwholesome, as wrong is ill; the lustful one, turning away from God, naturally ruins himself, which is possible only in self-deception.

6. *Renewal* is not accomplished by man in his own strength, but only in the acceptance and use of the vital strength promised and imparted to him with justification, hence in the appropriated power of God, in the strength of Divine life. Comp. *notes* 8, 10.

7. *Renewal* too, like corruption, has its history. As the latter proceeds from ἀνομία to ἀνομία, even to the end, θάνατος (Rom. vi. 19, 21), so in the former advance is made from hearing Christ to being taught in Him, from the scholar to the friend, the intimate of Christ, and from the servant of God, who permits himself to be thus termed, to heirship and participation in His kingdom. [Comp. *Exegetical Notes* on ver. 23.—R.]

8. *The beginning of the Christian walk* is the putting off the previous vices (ver. 28-32), and

* [Whatever view may be taken of ver. 23, or whatever psychological distinctions may be allowable in the exegesis of the New Testament, there is nothing here or elsewhere to indicate that man has a "spirit" unsubdued by the "flesh," unaffected by the fall. The natural state is the more awful, because the "spirit," the higher part, the point of connection with Divine influences, is under the dominion of sin.—R.]

from resistance, even if with feeble result, advance is made to victorious crucifixion of the flesh and its lusts (Gal. v. 16, 17, 24).

9. In this too *knowing* and *willing* stand in reciprocal action conditioning each other: learning Christ and putting on Christ, Christian science and Christian life. Theological faculties and the Church of Christ belong together. No knowledge should sunder itself from life, nor the science of Theology from the Christian Church. Where faith in Christ is not active, the scientific culture of individuals and churches will fare badly enough.

10. *The vital power of faith* must in the moral life-process prove itself real (*τῆς ἀληθείας*) and permeate the whole mode of life (*ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ*) from within to without (*ἐν ὁσιότητι*) and thus manifest itself in the walk. Faith, in itself a moral act, must prove itself in an ethical life-process.

[11. "This passage is of special doctrinal importance, as teaching us the true nature of the image of God in which man was originally created. That image did not consist merely in man's rational nature, nor in his immortality, nor in his dominion, but specially in that righteousness and holiness, that rectitude in all his principles, and that susceptibility of devout affections, which are inseparable from the possession of the truth, or true knowledge of God. This is the Scriptural view of the original state of man, or of original righteousness, as opposed, on the one hand, to the Pelagian theory, that man was created without moral character; and, on the other, to the Romish doctrine, that original righteousness was a supernatural endowment not belonging to man's nature. Knowledge, and consequently righteousness and holiness, were immanent or con-created in the first man, in the same sense as were his sense of beauty and susceptibility of impression from the external world." HODGE.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Deal earnestly with the conduct of those committed to you, as did the Apostle, and take care that none of your children can say: Father and mother have not told me of it.—Much depends upon this, that every one in his circle and place bears witness against the walk of the natural character and in favor of Christian conduct.—Consider, no one is lost except through his own fault; but perhaps through yours too!—Sin binds the will, so that it is not free, and blinds or darkens the Reason, so that it is not healthy. The two faculties act and react upon each other; it is madness for a sinner to boast of a sound reason. It is a fearful truth however, thou wilt have life, enjoy the world and yet thou destroyest thyself, most certainly thy soul at least. Where God's life and gift, peace and pure pleasure of the heart is wanting, there man wastes himself away, grasping in darkness for light, in emptiness for fulness, in apathy for life, aiming at these, and yet, at last, comfortless and unsatisfied.—Hold to Christian instruction and constantly try, whether thou art learning Christ: He is the measure of all truth.—Never forget: He is the Light; whoso is athirst, let him come to Him—and drink! You may know everything in the world, but not knowing Him, thy knowledge is nothing; you may know nothing of the world, knowing Him, trusting in Him, thy knowledge is rich.—The toil of self-denial and denial of the world cannot be spared you; but begin in the centre, in thyself, thy will and heart. What avails external alteration: that is by no means growing better. One must not be ever setting the tools and the plough in order; draw furrows through the field of thy heart and sow good seed therein, thus wilt thou reach the harvest and the harvest home. The sun makes the Spring and rejuvenates the earth, not single sunbeams, however, but the sun itself ever mounting higher, ever working longer. So Christ, who renews thee. Look how Peter with his sanguine temper became the rock-man, became constant, and John with his choleric disposition (Mark iii. 17; Luke ix. 54) was renewed into the Apostle of energetic love.

STARKE:—The natural knowledge of God is not the right one, and is far from sufficing for salvation, 1 Cor. i. 21.—The origin of all our sins is the "vanity of the mind" and the darkened understanding. We do not understand what the true good is, nor how we can attain to it. If we are to be helped, we must be helped in these respects, else a hardening results, and we become at last "without feeling."—All, even the best, in man is corrupted by nature, accordingly nothing is to be expected from his own strength.—Mark, man, the stripes of thy conscience, they are a favor from God; despise them not, lest thy heart be gradually led by the deceit of sin into obduracy.—He who does not live devoutly has not rightly learned or heard Christ.—In Christ Jesus is the truth, not a doctrine merely, but a righteous life, and this truth consists in a putting off of the old man and a putting on of the new.—He who rightly knows Christ, must, to honor Him, live holily.—It is a sheer impossibility to be a Christian and to be willing to continue walking in heathenish lusts.—Through a long habit of sinning, the understanding at length becomes so darkened, the conscience so insensible, the will so stubborn, that the man no longer perceives the danger of his sinful condition, has no more conscience about sin, and no desire to desist from sin.—Where sin began, there repentance must begin.

RIEGER:—The understanding would otherwise be a pre-eminent ornament of man, but it too has suffered much from the inroads of sin.—A proper character begins in us with the knowledge and confession of the might of sin, how it has clung to us from the time of our birth and extended itself as an old man over all our powers and members.

HEUBNER:—Where the will is corrupt, the understanding is darkened; blindness is the result of hardening.—Heathenism is life without God, Christianity life from God.—The Christian must ever begin anew and at the same time afresh. Daily repentance is needed, if we know the weakness, impurity, inconstancy of our hearts.—We will be ever seeing remnants of the old man appearing and returning here and there, and then a putting off of the old and putting on the new man is at once necessary again,

and a purging process must be begun as in the case of sick people.—There is no more certain sign of an unspiritual mind, than the question: What then is so bad in me? Am I then so entirely unlike the image of God?

PASSAVANT:—The history of the heathen of all ages and countries is a history of such vanity of mind, and of vanities; and all this vain character and action is renewed, re-decked and increased in the history of the character and doings of the heathen now-a-day, of the unbelieving and God-forsaken in Christendom. In the latter case the guilt is indeed greater, the injury deeper and the vanity worse.—This story of the origin of all heathen character and action, and of all idolatry in the world, repeats itself in every heart, which permits itself to be led through lustfulness and vanity of the mind away from the only true God into unbelief, disobedience and ingratitude. The will becomes perverted and evil, seducing in its turn the understanding and all the senses of man; and the mind, when it has once become false and vain, seduces in turn the impure heart, which has forsaken truth and faith; and here, in this impurity is the damnable ground and beginning of all ignorance and obduracy. That which is most exalted in us, which shall inherit immortality, our most beautiful, thinking, poetizing, loving, that which moves our whole heart and soul, what is inmost and most intellectual, our most profound life, our "spirit" itself must be renewed within us.

STIER:—The natural man in the vanity of his mind chooses what is void, empty and perishing, instead of what is Divinely real. Lust and deceit are akin.—Hearing, learning, becoming learned, are the three orderly degrees.—Man, corrupt by nature, destroys that which was created, God's Spirit in our spirit breaks anew the first creation. Once for all in the *Person of Christ* is that created and prepared for us, which we are to put on.

GERLACH:—The lusts paint joy for us and then bring misery, place man in opposition to his Creator, his eternal destiny, himself, making out of the whole character a lie.

ZIEL: *The heathenish nature in our Christian congregations of to-day.* From the text (vers. 17-32) we may perceive as in a mirror: 1) In what *inward* character of the *heart* (vers. 17-19), 2) in what *outward form* of the *conduct* it still manifests itself among us (vers. 25-32). *Conclusion:* To extirpate it by the roots, each one for himself, puts and must put it away from him.

On the Epistle for the 19*th Sunday after Trinity*, iv. 22-28.—LANGBEIN: How it is chiefly shown in social life, that something really new is born within us? When there is found, 1) in our mouth, instead of a lie, the truth, 2) in our heart, instead of wrath, placability, 3) in our hands, instead of unjust property, the gift of mercy.

THOLUCK: The virtue of Christian love of truth. 1 How does it manifest itself *a*) toward God, *b*) toward our neighbor, *c*) towards ourselves? 2. How do we attain to it? *a*) Through the consciousness of the continued presence of that eye, which sees in secret and to which a lie is an abomination, *b*) by taking the right standard, the Word of God.

F. A. WOLF: On the proper conduct of all in authority for the promotion of fidelity and probity in their subordinates. 1. Strict love of truth. 2. Forbearing earnestness in discipline and admonition. 3. Zeal for the public good in our own place and calling.

FLOREY:—A new man, a new life! 1) In words of truth, 2) mastery over the passions, 3) blamelessness in walk, 4) turning away from what is unjust, 5) activity in one's calling, 6) brotherly love in the heart.—Some principles for Christian parents in the education of their children 1. To convince them of the evil nature of their hearts. 2. To be helpful to the renewal of their mind in the Holy Ghost (Baptism, Home, School, Church). 3. To contend against their darling sins (lying, quick temper, slandering, purloining, tattling) and to help to the opposite virtues.

BRANDT: The new man in Christ. 1. Truthfulness his ornament. 2. His heart breathes love. 3. He allows himself to be guided by benevolence and trustfulness. 4. Faithful and honorable, is his watchword.—A rich harvest blessing is an urgent demand to put off the old man and to put on the new. Without this 1) we do not fulfil the design of God in bestowing this blessing, 2) with all our thanksgiving we cannot please God; 3) we are in danger of turning the blessing into a curse.

SPITTA: Believing and pious Christians should not walk as the heathen. 1. How the heathen walk. 2. Why Christians should not walk thus? 3. How they show proper earnestness in this.

GENZKEN (*Preparatory discourse*): The blessed barter (after Matt. ix. 16 f.). The old ragged mantle of the old man is cast away (the web of lust and error); 2. The Lord Jesus is put on (the garment of righteousness and honor).

[EADIE: Ver. 17. In the case of the heathen, all the efforts and operations of their spiritual nature ended in dreams and disappointment.—Ver. 18. Deep shadow lay upon the Gentile mind, unrelieved save by some fitful gleams which genius occasionally threw across it, and which were succeeded only by profounder darkness. A child in the lowest form of a Sunday School, will answer questions with which the greatest minds of the old heathen world grappled in vain.—There could be no light in their mind, because there was no life in their hearts, for the life in the Logos is the light of men.—Ver. 19. Self-abandonment to deeper sin is the Divine judicial penalty of sin.—Self was the prevailing power—the gathering in of all possible objects and enjoyments on one's self was the absorbing occupation. This accompaniment of sensualism sprang from the same root with itself, and was but another form of its development.—Ver. 20. Once dark, dead, dissolute and apathetic, they had learned Christ as the light and the life—as the purifier and perfecter of His pupils.—Ver. 22. This deceit is not simply error. It has assumed many guises. It gives a refined name to grossness, calls sensualism gallantry, and it hails drunkenness as good cheer. It promises fame and renown to one class, wealth and power to another, and tempts a third onward by the prospect of brilliant discovery. But genuine satisfaction is never gained, for God is forgotten — Ver. 24. While this spiritual creation is God's

peculiar work—for He who creates can alone re-create—this truth in Jesus has a living influence upon the heart, producing, fostering, and sustaining such rectitude and piety.—R.]

[SCHENKEL:—The characteristic marks of heathenish disposition: 1. Darkening of the mind, where the knowledge of what is Divine is concerned; 2. Hardening of the heart, where the repression of their own evil lusts is concerned.—Lust and greed the two fundamental sins of the natural man: 1. Their internal connection; 2. Their external difference.—To learn Christ 1) the Christian's first duty, 2) his highest wisdom.—The seal of true Christianity is the *new birth;* for 1) where this is wanting, all good works are but *seeming*, and 2) where it is present the life with good works must really be *teeming.*—The deceit of sin and the truth of redemption: 1. Sin corrupts man under the deceitful representations of evil lust; 2. Redemption heals man by restoring his original truth in righteousness and holiness.—R.]

b. Special traits of the new walk.

CHAP. IV. 25-32.

25 Wherefore putting [having put] away lying [falsehood], speak every man truth
[speak ye truth each one] with his neighbor: for we are members one of another.
26 Be ye angry [Be angry],[1] and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath
27, 28 [irritation]:[2] Neither [Nor yet][3] give place to the devil. Let him that stole
[who stealeth] steal no more [longer]: but rather let him labor, working with *his*
hands[4] the thing [that] which is good, that he may have to give [impart] to him
29 that needeth [who hath need]. Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your
mouth, but that which [whatever] is good to the use of edifying [for the building
up of the need],[5] that it may minister [give] grace unto the hearers [to those who
30 hear]. And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby [in whom] ye are [were]
31 sealed unto the day of redemption. Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and
32 clamor, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice: And be [become][6] ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another [each other],
even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven [in Christ forgave][7] you.[8]

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 26.—[*Ye* is omitted for the sake of euphony, and is inserted in ver. 25 for the same reason.—On the other changes see *Exeg. Notes.*—R.]

[2] Ver. 26.—[The article τ ῷ is omitted in ℵ.[1] A. B.; rejected by Lachmann, Meyer, bracketed by Alford. but on the authority of ℵ.[3] D. F. K. L., fathers, retained (as in *Rec.*) by most editors. The probability of its being omitted because the substantive was defined by ὑ μ ῶ ν is very great.—R.]

[3] Ver. 27.—[Instead of μήτε (*Rec.*, a few cursives, Chrysostom) most modern editors accept μ η δ έ on the authority of all our MSS. (ℵ. A. B., *etc*).—On the grammatical objection to the former reading, see *Exeg. Notes.*—*Nor yet*, see Ellicott's note on the translation of 1 Thess. ii. 3.—R.]

[4] Ver. 22.—[The variations are great: 1. We have the long reading τ α ῖ ς 'ι δ ί α ι ς χ ε ρ σ ὶ ν τ ὸ ἀ γ α θ ό ν (ℵ.[1] A. D. E. F. G., many versions), accepted by Lachmann, Tischendorf (ed. 1), Wordsworth, Eadie, Ellicott and others; the same words appearing with τ ὸ ἀ γ α θ ό ν coming first in K. and some cursives. 2. In many authorities ἰδίαις is omitted, and there is a strong suspicion of its interpolation from 1 Cor. iv. 12. Here too there is variety in the order; ℵ.[3] B. some fathers read: τ α ῖ ς χ ε ρ σ ὶ ν τ ὸ ἀ γ α θ ό ν (Meyer, Alford, 4th ed.), while the order is reversed in the *Rec.*, L., majority of cursives, many fathers (Griesbach, Scholz, Tischendorf, eds. 2, 7). 3. We have besides two briefer readings, almost wholly conjectural, though each claims a Father in support; the one τ α ῖ ς χ ε ρ σ ί ν alone (regarding τὸ ἀγαθόν as interpolated from Gal. vi. 10), the other τ ὸ ἀ γ α θ ό ν alone.—It will be seen then that the evidence strongly sustains the position of τ ὸ ἀ γ α θ ό ν at the *end* of the clause; accepting this, the only other question deserving attention is the genuineness of ἰ δ ί α ι ς. The *mass* of authority is in its favor, but very good authorities omit it. The internal evidence seems to be against it, for it may have been inserted from 1 Cor. iv. 12, and the special force attached to it by Ellicott (see *Exeg. Notes*) scarcely amounts to an argument for retaining it.—Braune's preference is rendered uncertain by an evident typographical error, but he rejects ἰ δ ί α ι ς.—R.]

[5] Ver. 29.—[D.[1] F., some fathers read πίστεως instead of χρείας; an evident correction.—*Give* is more literal than *minister*, which at the same time puts upon *grace* the sense of "Divine grace," *hearers* too is somewhat too technical in its present use.—R.]

[6] Ver. 32.—[B. and some minor authorities omit δ έ (Lachmann), while οὖν is found in D.[1] F. G. both readings probably due to a misapprehension of the relation between vers. 31, 32.—*Become* is more exact than *be; each other* (ἑ α υ τ ο ῖ ς) than *one another.*—R.]

[7] Ver. 32.—[Never was the E. V. more unfortunate in its rendering of the phrase ἐ ν Χ ρ ι σ τ ῷ.—The aorist requires here: *forgave.*—R.]

[8] Ver. 32.—[B. (according to Alford's personal inspection, not B.[2]) D. E. K. L. and a number of minor authorities read ἡ μ ῖ ν; accepted by Lachmann. But ℵ. A. F. and other authorities support ὑ μ ῖ ν. The probability of an alteration from v. 2 has decided most recent editors of the correctness of the *second person.*—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The general basis: no lie but the truth (ver. 25); the special points as respects *disposition* (vers. 26, 27), as respects *work* (ver. 28), word (vers. 29, 30); comprehensive conclusion (vers. 31, 32).

Ver. 25. *The general basis.* **Wherefore,** *διό*, gives the connection with what precedes ("no longer walk as the rest of the Gentiles walk"), and, as the exhortations with their positive and negative sides show, with special reference to vers. 22-24. Hence immediately: **having put away falsehood,** *ἀποθέμενοι τὸ ψεῦδος.*—According to Ps. cxvi. 11 ("all men are liars"); lxii. 10; Rom. iii. 4, the first duty of every natural man is to put away the lie, especially as the connection with the kingdom of darkness is thereby indicated. For the devil is the liar from the beginning, who slew man, leading him away out of the truth of life in God (Jno. viii. 44). Hence [the abstract]* *τὸ ψεῦδος*, which is not *τὸ ψεύδεσθαι*, nor=lies (LUTHER); it is the opposite of the "truth as it is in Jesus." Comp. 1 Jno. ii. 4; iv. 20; v. 10. It does not occur then, because it is the principal spiritual sin of heathenism and has as its result a darkening of the spirit (SCHENKEL). This requirement is of deeper scope than to allow it to be said that even heathen ethics could designate and forbid this as sin.

Speak ye truth each one with his neighbor [*λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ*].—This exhortation is [a reminiscence] from Zech. viii. 16 (LXX.): *λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ.* The article is wanting with *ἀλήθειαν*, in order to mark that not the complete, entire truth is to be spoken; that cannot be done at the beginning; only let what you do say be true. Paul substitutes the preposition *μετά* for *πρός*, in order to give special prominence to the intercommunion in the speaking with each other [STIER] and to bring to mind the *Christian* brother, as the context requires. The reference is not to "neighbor" in the wider sense, to all men. The Apostle is treating of the Church of Christ.

For we are members one of another [*ὅτι ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων μέλη*].—This is the motive: to be members one of another and to belie one another, how contradictory (MEYER)! *Est enim monstrum, si membra inter se non consentiant imo si fraudenter inter se agant* (CALVIN). Christians are "members one of another," not merely members of the body of Christ, but each has to do for the other, to give to him, as well as to receive from him and permit him to do in return. The reciprocal *ἐπιχορηγία* of speaking the truth (STIER) is marked. It is entirely similar to Rom. xii. 5-8; 1 Cor. xii. 15-27.† The passage is full of significance, not inexact (GROTIUS, RUECKERT and others), and is not to be applied to the Gentiles and the Jews, as is done even by BENGEL.

THE PARTICULAR POINTS: *a.*) *As respects the disposition: anger without sin*, since in the Church so great occasion to anger especially is given to the Christian with his natural man, and the fellowship is so easily disturbed thereby, and the Christian himself corrupted: vers. 26-27.

Ver. 26. **Be angry and sin not** [*ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε*].—The first verb is to be taken as imperative, in this series of imperatives (vers. 25-32). This is further required by the circumstance, that it is a citation (Ps. iv. 5: רִגְזוּ וְאַל־תֶּחֱטָאוּ translated by the LXX. precisely as Paul here writes it): the original and the Greek version are undoubtedly imperative. The passage in the Psalms is rendered by LUTHER: Be angry, so that ye sin not; this passage: Be angry and sin not. The sense is evidently equivalent to *ὀργιζόμενοι μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε* (WINER, p. 292), which not only states the case in which they would become angry, but also expresses that the anger is allowed, aye commanded and righteous. This is only the more strongly marked by the two imperatives joined with *καί*, the second of which only is negatived (*μή*); accordingly Paul used this form, this citation.* The original text in the Psalm, in which the main matter is the transformation of the angry *quousque tandem* to rest and gentleness, is correctly rendered by the LXX. (HENGSTENBERG, HITZIG, STIER, against EWALD, HARLESS and others). It can only be affirmed that Paul did not wish to prove anything by the citation (HARLESS); he wishes only to use the words of David, but does not use the words of the LXX. to strengthen those which they are acquainted with; it is incorrect to suppose that nothing depends on the sense of the original passage (RUECKERT). The Sacred Scriptures, which speak of the wrath of God, showing us Christ in anger at the cleansing of the temple (John ii. 13-16; Matt. xxi. 12, 13), do not reject anger: Jas. i. 19, 20; Rom. xii. 19; Eccles. vii. 9. So here, for we do not read: Do not be angry and sin, the negative cannot be moved forward so as to qualify the first verb (WINER, p. 460). Hence we need not accept an unwilling permission of anger (DE WETTE, WINER); in that case *ἀλλά* would be found in place of *καί*. Nor is "be angry" in accordance with an assumed Hebraism to be taken *conditionaliter* on account of the connection with a following imperative (RUECKERT, ZYRO, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1841, p. 690), [HODGE apparently]: that would really mean: if ye are

* [Notice the frequent use of abstract nouns, almost personifications, in this chapter. Here "the vice and habit of lying" is meant, which is a chief characteristic of the "old man," a natural and immediate result of the essential selfishness of sin. The aorist participle is preferred here (=having put away), "because the man must have once for all put off falsehood as a characteristic before he enters the habit of speaking truth" (ALFORD).—R.]

† ["The force of the exhortation does not rest on any mere ethical considerations of our obligations to society, or on any analogy that may be derived from the body (Chrysostom), but on the deeper truth that in being members of one another we are members of the body of Christ."—ELLICOTT. The analogy CHRYSOSTOM draws is striking, however, and deserving of notice: "If the eye were to spy a serpent or a wild beast, will it lie to the foot?" *etc.*—R.]

* [This is perhaps the view now generally received. Both imperatives are jussive; anger is not only allowable, but commanded in certain cases, yet the Apostle forbids the joining of sin with it; in so doing the emphasis resting on the second imperative obscures the jussive force of the first one, rendering it rather *assumptive:* Be angry (for this must be so) and do not sin. So EADIE, ALFORD, MEYER, ELLICOTT and others.—R.]

angry, ye will not sin. The limitation of "sin not" to reconciliation (Harless), to the exclusion of enmity against others (Zyro), is incorrect because not in accordance with the context. The acceptance of an interrogation (Grotius: are ye angry?) is inadmissible on account of the quotation.

Let not the sun go down upon your irritation [ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω ἐπὶ τῷ παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν].—This thought is occasioned by the citation (Ps. iv. 5) and the matter itself. There is also in the expression "let not the sun go down," a reminiscence of Deut. xxv. 13, 15, according to which the poor man should receive his cloak, given in pledge, and wages should be paid before sundown. There is no reference to the Pythagorean precept to be reconciled before sunset; and quite as little to Christ, the Sun of Righteousness (Augustine), certainly none to the Reason (Lombard). The [non-classical and rare] word παροργισμός occurs only here; it is related to παροργίζεσθαι (Eph. vi. 4; Col. iii. 21; Rom. x. 19), meaning the anger aroused in us, the being or becoming angry, which should not continue, nor be carried about and nourished. *Affectus noctu retentus alte insidet* (Bengel). Anger thus becomes hate, rancor. What is right towards the occurrence, *viz.*, being angry, should not when that is past, be retained against the person, who remains. The preposition παρά does not indicate something wrong (Zanchius), [Wordsworth], and the article, marking the momentary being angry, connected with ὀργίζεσθαι, is not incorrect (Stier). [Comp. *Textual Note* [2]. Alford brackets the article, suggesting that the omission gives the sense "upon any παροργισμός." The word *irritation* preserves the reference to occasion given indicated by παρά, and at the same time distinguishes (in English) from the "wrath" which is forbidden in ver. 31.—R.]

Ver. 27. **Nor yet give place to the devil** [μηδὲ δίδοτε τόπον τῷ διαβόλῳ.]—Μηδέ is disjunctive and adds something new (Matt. vi. 25); while μήτε is adjunctive, adding something which belongs to the foregoing (Matt. v. 34-36). Comp. Winer, p. 457.* Besides not sinning by prolonging wrath, they should not sin by giving place to the devil. Δίδοτε τόπον designates, as in Rom. xii. 19, affording free play, wide space, of course in the heart. But to whom? to the devil, as in vi. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 26, even though it does not elsewhere occur in this sense in Paul's writings, but more frequently describes slanderers, or a slanderous manner (1 Tim. iii. 6, 7, 11; Tit. ii. 3).† The antithesis is found in ver. 30. Hence it does not mean: the blasphemer (Luther and others) or talebearer, as many hold. Nor is the verse to be applied to social life (Harless); the context requires a reference to individuals. Sinful anger brings even the Christian's heart into the power of Satan, from whom he was freed, destroying the fellowship with the Redeemer and His grace.

Ver. 28 *b. As respects work: Honesty reaching to benevolence.* **Let him who stealeth steal no longer** [ὁ κλέπτων μηκέτι κλεπτέτω].—Ὁ κλέπτων, which is neither=ὁ κλέψας, nor =ὁ κλέπτης, marks the act or the action, not the character; hence it is stronger than "him who stole," and weaker than "the thief." Comp. Winer, p. 331. Luther is therefore incorrect [rendering as in E. V.]; Bengel also: *qui furabatur*, adding however: *præsenti hic non excluso.** The notion of stealing, however, must not be limited here by the definition of criminal law and police regulation, but be conceived of from the stand-point of Christian ethics, as in the case of the eighth commandment. That deportment of the natural man over against the possessions of his neighbor, which ought to be overcome, is here treated of. It is incorrect to suppose idle habitual thieves are meant (Schenkel).—In the Christian ethical sense there is added: μηκέτι κλεπτέτω. Hence it is unnecessary to inquire why nothing is said of restitution (Michaelis), and the opinion that this exhortation is unsuitable, because it does not correspond with the Apostle's strictness (De Wette), is not pertinent. The Apostle's strictness and the Christian view follow immediately:

But rather let him labor, working with his hands that which is good [μᾶλλον δὲ κοπιάτω ἐργαζόμενος ταῖς χερσὶν τὸ ἀγαθόν. See *Textual Note* [4].].—Μᾶλλον δέ gives prominence to the antithesis. With the emphatically placed κοπιάτω Paul includes laziness and idleness as the beginning and ground of theft (Bengel: *sæpe furtum et otium sunt una*), and all the more decidedly by designating as the antithesis: "working with his hands that which is good." The participle denotes the active, assiduous performance, corresponding slightly with ἐργασία, ver. 19 (Stier); it is not earning, gaining, as the object is not external possessions, or handicraft, trade (Meyer, De Wette). Bengel is excellent: *Antitheton ad furtum, prius manu piceata* (*i. e.*, hands to which whatever comes near sticks as to pitch, *pix*) *male commissum;* on "with his hands" (the hands of the thief), he adds: *quibus ad furtum abusus erat.*† Rom. vi. 19.

* [In addition to the critical grounds for rejecting μήτε, the grammatical objection should be noted. Μήτε here would presuppose another μήτε, while μή precedes. The sequence is therefore abnormal. Meyer suggests that it might occur, if the second member were an after-thought, but it never does occur in Paul's writings. This verse is therefore connected with the preceding, but as an affirmative sentence would be through δέ.—R.]

† [In two of these instances the meaning is: the devil, in the other two, without the article, it may mean *slanderous* (as an adjective applied to women in both cases). Meyer is probably right in affirming that the substantive διαβολος in the New Testament *always* means: the devil. So Hodge, Alford and Ellicott. "A name derived from the fearful nature and, so to say, office of the Evil One."—R.]

* [Eadie: "Some, shocked at the idea that any connected with the Ephesian Church should be committing such a sin, have attempted to attenuate the meaning of the word." So Jerome, Calvin, and Hodge who accepts the past sense. But such sinners may yet have been in the Church. See 1 Cor. v. 1; 2 Cor. xii. 21. In the service of the Reformed Church for the ordination of Deacons, this gloss occurs: "Let him that stole (or who hath been burthensome to his neighbor)," as an admonition to those who too long depend on the charities of the Church.—R.]

† [Ellicott retains ἰδίαις and says: "The thievish man lives by the labors and hands of others: he is now himself to labor, and with his *own hands*, not at τὸ κακόν, but at τὸ ἀγαθόν." But such an antithesis seems doubtful. The verse is better explained thus: He who steals (whether a thief or a so-called "business-man") should stop this, and go to work, to real labor. The participial clause then adds how: let him

The hands should now do the good, that in its proper time and place must be done; then there will not be wanting something to bestow upon the needy.

That he may have to impart to him who hath need [ἵνα ἔχῃ μεταδιδόναι τῷ χρείαν ἔχοντι].—"That he may have" sets forth the purpose, not of him who labors, as if the work should be done on this account, but of the enjoining Apostle, the ruling Lord.* He should have something to give (μεταδιδόναι), for "we are members one of another" (ver. 25). This should take the place of stealing. "To him who hath need," to him from whom recompense is not to be expected. Instead of stealing there is required an honesty and activity, which impels to beneficence. Whether the question about restitution is necessary and ethical earnestness and depth are missed here—is evident enough. See *Doctr. Notes.*

c. As respects speech: no foul word, but gracious discourse tending to edification; vers. 29, 30.

Ver. 29. **Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth** [πᾶς λόγος σαπρὸς ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ἐκπορευέσθω].—The subject: πᾶς λόγος σαπρός is assumed as present in the mouth of the readers while the predicate forbids: let it not proceed out; not *one* such should be expressed, v. 5; John iii. 16; 1 John ii. 21. [Literally: "let every foul saying not come forth."—R.] See WINER p. 162 f. BENGEL: *si jam in lingua sit, resorbete.* Σαπρός, from σήπω, σαπῆναι, spoiled by putrefaction, corrupt, used of fishes (Matt. xiii. 48), of fruit (Matt. xii. 33; Luke vi. 43), of a tree (Matt. vii. 17, 18; xii. 33; Luke vi. 43), denotes according to the antithesis (ἀγαθὸς πρός) uselessness, but it is certainly chosen to designate both what is decayed, worn-out, ruined, and what is disgusting and stinking; BENGEL: *vetustatem redolens.* Comp. κενὸς λογός, v. 6; ῥῆμα ἀργόν, Matt. xii. 36. In these passages the emptiness and unprofitableness is more prominent, here however the loathsomeness. THEODORET: αἰσχρολογία, λοιδορία, συκοφαντία, βλασφημία, ψευδολογία καὶ τὰ τούτοις ποίσοιμα.

But whatever is good for the building up of the need.—Ἀλλὰ (*sc.* ἐκπορευέσθω), εἴ τις ἀγαθὸς (*sc.* ἐστι) πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας. Over against the prohibition the acceptance of wholesome speech takes a very modest attitude; over against πᾶς we have here εἴ τις. BENGEL: *non postulatur ab omnibus par facundia.* Ἀγαθός, however, as in Rom. xv. 2, designates what is internally, morally good, not merely what is fitting (HARLESS), [HODGE, EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT]; that would be too external. The genitive of reference has been aptly rendered by LUTHER: where it is needed. This refers to the time when, to the place where, to the person to whom, to the method how, and to the purport which, we are to speak. "According to Jerome it applies also *juxta opportunitatem loci, temporis et personæ ædificare audientes*" (STIER). Col. iv. 6: "How ye ought to answer every man." [ELLICOTT also takes the genitive as one of reference; "edifying as regards the need, *i. e.*, which satisfies the need." ALFORD follows MEYER in regarding it as the regular objective genitive="the defect to be supplied by edification," so that the sense is "the edification of the present deficiency or need calling for it." The hypallage of the *Syriac*, BEZA, followed in the E. V., is clearly wrong, also *qua sit opus* (ERASMUS and others).—R.]. It is incorrect to take ἡ χρεία=οἱ χρείαν ἔχοντες (RUECKERT, OLSHAUSEN).

That it may give grace to those who hear [ἵνα δῷ χάριν τοῖς ἀκούουσι].—"That" refers to the design of the enjoining Apostle, not that of the obeying member of the congregation. The subject of "give grace" is "good word;" we do not then read "that ye may give." LUTHER presents very well the manner, the esthetic side: "that it may be gracious;" for χάρις means also the gracefulness, agreeableness, of the discourse; just as in Col. iv. 6: "in grace," Luke iv. 22. But the inner side, the matter, must not be overlooked, nor put in a secondary place; it must be a kindness. HARLESS includes this alone, but incorrectly; a befriending, agreeable act of kindness is meant, which should make this impression on the hearers: whether it profits them, is their own affair. STIER seems to be not incorrect, in finding here (δῷ) an echo of ver. 28 (μεταδιδόναι), and a spiritual gift in the seasoned but pleasant word spoken with unction. [ALFORD retains the theological meaning of χάρις: "minister spiritual benefit; be a means of conveying through you the grace of God" (so E. V.). HODGE on the other hand follows HARLESS, holding that the phrase always means to confer a favor; "that it may benefit the hearers." ELLICOTT accepts the non-theological sense of χάρις, but adds that owing to its change of meaning in the New Testament, there seems to be even in this phrase a reference to *spiritual* benefit. He renders: "that it may impart a blessing."—R.]

Ver. 30. **And,** καί, connects closely with what precedes; so much depends on proper speech.—**Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God,** μὴ λυπεῖτε πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ θεοῦ.—The verb forbids injuring, disturbing, rendering sorrowful, pointing thus to an intimate fellowship, in which joyous love toward and among each other should prevail, and to a tender conduct and intercourse; for it happens *per sermones putres* (BENGEL). The object is "the Holy Spirit of God." This full designation shows the importance of the matter and compels us to recognize the objective reality and Personality of the Holy Ghost. *Shepherd of Hermas*, ii. 10: μὴ θλῖβε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ ἐν σοὶ κατοικοῦν, μήποτε ἐντεύξηται κατὰ σοῦ καὶ ἀποστῇ

accomplish by assiduous effort with his hands something good, instead of this past evil. The purpose of the effort follows in the next clause. The sum of the whole is: *Honest manual labor.* 1. *Labor*, 2. *better with the hands* than with the dishonest wits; 3. above all let it be honest as to means and good as to end.—R.]

* [This is evidently stated by the Apostle as "the true specific object of all Christian labor, and just to the extent that the work is done on this account, will it be itself Christian." The laborer may be unconscious of this end at times, but it is necessarily *his end* in labor as a Christian. The verse is worth a whole library of volumes on social science. Its precepts would make many a so-called merchant or professional man go to manual labor, while on the other hand this last clause would settle the "workman's question" far more effectually than the whole array of socialistic theories, Agrarian appeals, trades unions and "strikes." But Prudhomme is too often preferred to Paul.—R.]

ἀπὸ σοῦ. He who speaks out the foul thing which comes from his mind to his lips, injures thus the Holy Spirit in himself, and in others also. The plural means also: Ye, each one in himself, or in others too. The Holy Ghost like God is not apathetic, but capable of being affected. Rom. viii. 26. He feels what occurs in us, as a loving Friend, who does not Himself change, but will help us and change us, so long as we grant that He be not rejected. This is a possible final result, in spite of the close connection in which He stands to us, and in spite of the help and blessedness, which He produces in us. Both ideas are added in the relative clause which follows:

In whom ye were sealed unto the day of redemption, ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως.—The first thought is contained in the expression: "in whom ye were sealed," in whom*=in fellowship with whom, ye were sealed (i. 13); the other is marked by "unto the day of redemption" (i. 14); *hic dies est novissimus, cujus representatio quædam est in die mortis; præsupponit dies citeriores* (Rom. ii. 16); *in illo maxime die referet, quis inveniatur obsignatus* (Bengel). Isa. lxiii. 10 (where the LXX. have incorrectly rendered עִצְּבוּ, παρώξυναν; the *Vulgate* is better: (*afflixerunt*) should be compared, not as though this were a citation, but on account of the similar thought.

Accordingly λυπεῖν is not to be pared down to a mere troubling (Bengel: *turbare*), nor is the human spirit to be regarded as the object (De Wette; Christian feeling), nor is the capability of being affected which belongs to God and the Holy Ghost to be rejected or regarded as a mere anthropomorphism; the reference to the possibility of being forsaken by the Holy Ghost should not be denied (Schenkel). There is both great kindness and earnestness in the warning thus formulated and emphasized: "in the case of the unredeemed sin it is a transgression of the law (Rom. iv. 15, *etc.*), in the case of the redeemed it is a wounding of the Holy Ghost" (Harless), whose tempter he is (ii. 22). Not by threatenings respecting the punishment of hell, but by holy dread of grieving the Holy Ghost, and wholesome fear of the day of Judgment, which with Him is only the day of Redemption, does the Apostle seek to persuade and strengthen.†

Comprehensive conclusion; vers. 31, 32. *a. The negative side*, ver. 31; *b. The positive side*, ver. 32.

Ver. 31. **Let all bitterness.**—Πικρία (Heb. xii. 15; Acts viii. 23; Rom. iii. 14) is ill-temper, animosity, unholy indignation, as πικραίνεσθαι, Col. iii. 19. Comp. ζῆλος πικρός, Jas. iii. 14. It is entirely internal, concealed in the heart ["the prevailing temperament and frame of mind" (Ellicott).—R.].—**And wrath.**—Θυμός is excitement, passionate movement of the temper, in selfishness, unrestrained and disorderly.—**And anger.**—Ὀργή is the passion concentrating itself, directed against a particular person with the purpose of hurting him. Ὁ θυμὸς γεννητικός ἐστι τῆς ὀργῆς (Œcumenius). According to the context carnal anger is spoken of; hence there is nothing to be inferred respecting ver. 26 from this passage. Bengel is incorrect: *hactenus descendit climax;* but he properly compares the first with χρηστοί, the second with εὔσπλαγχνοι, the third with χαριζόμενοι (ver. 32) as their respective antitheses. Comp. Tittmann, *Syn.* I., p. 131 ff. [Also Trench, *Syn.* § xxxvii.; Donaldson, *New Cratylus*, §§ 476, 477; Galatians v. 20.]

We now pass to the breaking out of what was within, to its becoming perceptible in look, mien and gesture: **and clamor.**—Κραυγή (Acts xxiii. 9) is wild, rough crying, refers to the voice, improperly strained and sharpened, as in scolding, upbraiding, to the casting about of words uninterruptedly. It is the steed of anger (Chrysostom).*—**And evil speaking,** βλασφημία, pointing to the purport of the speaking, is aspersion of one's neighbor, λοιδορία (Col. iii. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 4; Matt. xii. 31; xv. 19), yet sharper than this, not merely like "Raca" (Matt. v. 22), abusing the mental or civil capacity of a brother, but like "thou fool," the moral capacity for God's kingdom, and hence not without a reference to God (Stier), blaspheming possibly or probably. "All," which belongs to all the substantives, refers to the various degrees, from the coarsest among common people to the most refined among the educated; so θυμοί, 2 Cor. xii. 20.

Be put away from you.—Ἀρθήτω ἀφ' ὑμῶν is a stronger conclusion of "putting away" (ver. 25); it must take place with power in the mighty help of One stronger than we, to whom all this clings.—**With all malice.**—Σὺν πάσῃ κακίᾳ, the *fermentum* of the bitterness (Meyer) and the rest ["the *active principle* to which they are all due"], refers to malice, *malignitas* and *malitia* (Rom. i. 29; Col. iii. 8), both the quality and its manifestation, in order to sum up in conclusion all that cannot be enumerated.

[Eadie: "This verse contains not only a catalogue, but a melancholy genealogy of bad passions; acerbity of temper exciting passion; that passion heated into indignation; that indignation throwing itself off in indecent brawling, and that brawling darkening into libel and abuse; a malicious element lying all the while at the basis of these enormities."—R.]

Ver. 32. *The positive side.* **And become ye,** γίνεσθε δέ.—Thus the antithesis is strongly

* [Not *by* whom (whereby, E. V.), Hodge, since God is the Sealer, the Spirit the seal; comp. i. 13.—R.]

† [It is precisely this thought of the Apostle, so correctly stated by Braune, which throws doubt upon the reference to the possibility of losing the seal, found here by Harless, Stier, Alford and Braune (*Doctr. Note* 6). But the mention of a seal is not suggestive of such a possibility, nor is "grieving the Spirit"=resisting the Spirit, the latter being predicated of unbelievers only (Acts v. 51). Besides had Paul wished to convey this idea παροξύνετε (from Isa. lxiii. 10, LXX) was probably in his memory, and this would have expressed such a thought far better. Of course the caution assumes a logical possibility of falling, which is practical enough, but the appeal is to love not to fear. While the Scriptures always thus exhort men, it seems to be a species of anthropomorphism also, for the more theological and soteriological statements preclude such a possibility. Even here where the verse begins with such a caution, there is at once added a mention of the "seal" and of "the day of redemption" as the end, which suggests the doctrine of "final perseverance" rather than the opposite. Comp. Eadie and Hodge *in loco.* —R.]

* [Chrysostom adds: "Let women especially attend to this, as they on every occasion cry out and brawl. There is but one thing in which it is needful to cry aloud, and that is in teaching and preaching."—R.]

marked at the very start, as not finished at one stroke, but having a development, a history.*—**Kind one to another.**—Εἰς ἀλλήλους is put first, marking chiefly the fellowship. Χρηστοί (Luke v. 39; vi. 35; 1 Pet. ii. 3; Rom. ii. 4) helping the χρεία; *ingeniosius quam verius* is the reference to the name: Christians (OLSHAUSEN). Comp. TITTMANN, *Syn.* I., 140, 195.—**Tender-hearted,** εὔσπλαγχνοι (like 1 Pet. iii. 8) refers to sympathy, fellow-feeling, hearty compassion. [Comp. *Colossians*, p. 69].—**Forgiving each other,** χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς (2 Cor. ii. 7, 10; xii. 13), marks the tender, considerate, forbearing, forgiving life among themselves; ἑαυτοῖς points more strongly than ἀλλήλοις to the existing unity, where one deals with another as himself (Col. iii. 13). [The former thought is from STIER, the latter from ORIGEN, but they are not to be pressed too far.—R.]

Even as God in Christ forgave you [καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν].—Καθώς† is as in i. 4 (HARLESS). Καί joins the readers to God, to the clause "God in Christ forgave you" The notion is as in Matt. vi. 12, 14. God's mercy and grace is manifest in Christ, proved itself in Christ, in the death (2 Cor. v. 19) of Him who accomplished the reconciliation of the world with God. "In Christ" belongs to the verb, the predicate, not to "God," the subject. [Either connection presents a truth: God in Christ, manifested in Christ, forgave us, but God forgave in Christ, in giving Him to be a propitiation for our sins. The latter thought seems more appropriate with the aorist which refers to a definite past act; it is neither "hath forgiven" (E. V.), nor "will forgive," a gloss our feeble faith puts on it.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The lie* is put first by the Apostle as a fundamental vice. It is the *loveless* misuse of language and the means for communicating the thoughts of the heart, with the design of *deceiving* our neighbor. It injures love, therefore one's own heart, and one's neighbor, it injures fellowship and truth, and thus one's own heart again, which needs these, and our neighbor, who needs them no less. The untruth must be *intentional;* otherwise it is merely not true, an error, not amounting to a lie. The *deception* must be *intentional:* Drama, irony, satire, joke, conventionalities are not lies; for in these it is presupposed that our neighbor understands this language and can translate it into his own. What is conventional is the language of humanity, which should come from the heart and become natural, as in Fenelon. A lie is an *act* of lovelessness against our neighbor, even when not intended to injure him, perhaps only to help or assure ourselves or others, to make preposterous stories, something out of nothing, like all frivolous lies, which, however innocent they may appear, are still the school for turning frivolity into mischief. The word itself does not necessarily make the lie; it may be consummated in silence, in countenance, in gesture or act; but at all events it is an abuse of God's gift for the manifestation of our thoughts and perceptions. Its opposite is *truthfulness*, love of truth, which is at the same time love to mankind. It is indeed not possible without some circumspection and restriction, since it does not consist in having the heart on the tongue, but in having the tongue in the heart.

This vice is less strange among men than many others, so that even the better class of people, the pious world also, has an elastic conscience respecting this point. The conventional mode of life with its illusion and deception makes truthfulness utterly impossible, unless Christ becomes a living power in us. In lying as in stealing, a beginning is made in a little thing, and then come bolder advances, until an extreme is reached: one lie is told to conceal another, instead of forgiveness being sought, and then comes shameless, impudent untruth. It comes from the devil and leads to him; it is the devil's own vice (John viii. 44). The Scripture forbids it unconditionally, especially the Lord Himself (Matth. xii. 36, 37); it does not approve of the untruths of the Hebrew midwives, of Michal, Jonathan, *etc.*, only narrating them as facts. Although lying mainly injures fellowship, yet it is not to be so connected therewith as to be considered allowable where no fellowship exists; nor is it to be so contra-distinguished from love, that a lie is not to be regarded as such, where the latter is active, even though the untruth is spoken with an intention of deceiving. The former principle applies to robbers, murderers and thieves; the latter to children, lunatics, drunkards and passionate people. In the first case it is not allowable like stratagem in war or in peril of life, and in the other truth should not become poison or poniard.* Over against the sophistry: verbal truth should not stand against hearty love, the rigoristic principle, which allows no lie in an emergency, is justified. It is better inconsistently to deny in books and in the pulpit the right of untruth, and in life and in the household to practise it, than at the expense of truth to serve a false one. To speak an untruth on account of a neighbor's necessity out of love for him is still a lie; personal need, personal interest does not first give it this character; the necessity of a neighbor gives no justification to a lie in a case of emergency.

2. *Anger*, which, in God, is the energy of holy love against sin and corruption disturbing and perverting moral order, is justified in the Scriptures. Affirmed of God more than *three hundred times*, it cannot be wrong of itself in man who is created after the image of God; it is rather a

* [ALFORD is scarcely justified in saying that "become" removes the precept too far from the present. ELLICOTT rightly takes the verb as implying evil elements among them, yet to be taken away; hence the appropriateness of δέ. See *Textual Note* [6].—R.]

† [This particle introduces an example, having at the same time an argumentative force; not *because*, as HODGE renders it here also.—R.]

* [Lies to children are fearfully common. Surely the motive ("for we are members one of another") in this case has unusual force. To say that such lies are necessary, is to say that it is necessary to blacken a child's heart. In the liveliness of childish imagination they are great romancers themselves, but at the same time sensitive to an untruth told them. How can they have faith in God, when those who stand for the time being in the place of God prove unworthy of belief? What they cannot understand should be declared incomprehensible to them, not misstated. What would we think of our Heavenly Father, if He dealt otherwise with us?—R.]

witness and basis of active love in the surroundings of an unholy world. The *right* to be angry is admitted and granted, but to be angry *rightly* however. Loveless anger is as incorrect as angerless love. Without ardent hatred towards *what* is wicked, there can be no lawful anger towards *those* who are wicked. It is difficult to separate the two; comp. Jude 23; Rev. ii. 6, 15; Rom. xii. 9; Ps. xcvii. 10; Amos v. 15. The Apostle here gives prominence to the pernicious element of that anger which becomes a lingering grudge, and to the danger of thus falling a prey to the devil; it corrupts man inwardly and makes him the slave of Satan; the "irreconcilable remains the unreconciled, incurring the wrath and judgment of God." See PALMER, *Moral*, p. 373.

3. *Property* and *Theft* stand in the closest relation. The latter attaches not only to the lack of the former, but rather to its acquisition, preservation and expenditure. A Christian should have more than he requires for himself; there should be a surplus for others, even though he be a day-laborer. The opposite of thievishness is *Industry*, which leads to opulence; with this many continued and varied exercises of Christian virtue stand connected, and *Benevolence*, personal, private benevolence, both secret and open; this is required, not the public, municipal charity. The emphasis rests on *personal* benevolence, which succors and devotes itself to need, not on police alms. Honesty should proceed toward benevolence, and what hampers and weakens the latter, has the blot of dishonesty upon it. Avarice, dissipation, vanity, laziness, negligence, debauchery and idleness are theft. See BRAUNE, *Die heilig.* 10 *Gebote*, pp. 178–189; PALMER, *Moral*, p. 375.

[The scope of the negative precept ("steal no longer") may be inferred from the positive statement which follows: It forbids idleness in general ("labor") and laziness ("working"), implying also that those who are neither idle nor lazy may yet "steal," because their work is neither "with the hands" nor for "that which is good" (speculation, sinecures, sharp business habits, *etc.*). Further all labor, however assiduous, proper and honest, which does not aim at a *surplus to give away* is not *distinctively Christian.* Though no one has a right to *demand* from capital (*i. e.*, the accumulated surplus of labor), yet here is the responsibility of the Christian capitalist. On the other hand, the positive principle of honesty here set forth bids us labor, that we may have a *capital* for benevolence; so that begging, combining to extort, or even legislating in favor of idleness, is not in accordance with the Apostle's view. Paul by his example (Acts xviii. 3; xx. 34; 2 Thess. iii. 8), as well as by the strongest precepts (Acts xx. 35; 2 Thess. iii. 10) exalts the *dignity of manual labor.* To despise labor is a mark of barbarism, involving as a result either the indigence of savage freedom or the injustice of not less savage slavery. Unless the curse pronounced (Gen. iii. 19) upon the man be accepted and transformed by such acceptance into a blessing, it becomes a worse misfortune. As a working man then Paul appears equally removed from the capitalist hoarding only for self and from those champions of labor who talk too much to work and who ask the same wages for the ignorant and lazy as belongs of right to skill and industry. Appealing to his hands hardened by toil, he says: "So laboring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how He said, It is more blessed to give than to receive."—R.]

4. The entire scope of speech is here in question: The essential characteristic of Christian speech, well pleasing to God, is "good for the edifying of the need," a furthering in accordance with the necessity of the case. This applies to the preacher and pastor, to the social circle, the popular orator, be he democratic or conservative, and to the statesman as well. To have regard to place, time and auditors, and to regulate both matter and manner accordingly: this is the conscientious scrupulousness of the Christian! The minister should spare all pious phraseology which is not to edification, and not be content with showing and proving his Confession of Faith, without any regard to the necessities of the occasion. *Magna vis est in colloquiis piis* (BENGEL). Much therefore depends on the fitting word; comp. BRAUNE, *Die heil. Gebote*, p. 205 ff.

5. *General remarks: a. Sin is universal;* it attaches not to the heathen only, but to the natural, unregenerate man as a ruling power; nor is it to be found especially in one class, race or period. —*b. Sin* as a *whole* is referred to: sin of thought, word and deed; here too the coarser or finer form, the secret or open manner makes no difference.—The Apostle so sketches the *substance* of sin, that at first glance we are shocked, and can imagine, it exists only in numerous circles, strata and periods, in the heathen or the remarkably degraded; but if we look more closely, we find it everywhere and in all ages, often indeed under the gloss of culture and elegant manners. The *appearance* of sin is in the extremities, but its seat is in the very noblest organs, from which it extends through the whole body of our race, without He helps who is the Head of His Church.

6. The *motives* presented are: God's mercy in Christ over us, the precious gift of the Holy Ghost in us, the thought of the day of decision before us. God's own aim is what is morally good; to injure this is to injure Him, to obstruct, disturb and destroy His working for us and in us. God's unchangeableness is not the impossibility of being affected; that would be imperfection, indolence (Jas. v. 16–18). Our new birth may, like the life of one born, be again taken away, the sealing of the Holy Ghost be again taken from us. He who does not look at the goal not yet attained and still held up, does not preserve what he has received in his spirit from the Spirit of God. We can lose the grace of God, can again fall into condemnation without recovery, much as it is denied.* Heb. vi. 4–6.

* [In the original Dr. Braune adds: "by the Methodists and Baptists," an oversight which is singular enough; it may be accounted for by remembering that these two denominations are almost the only ones which operate among German Protestants as missionaries. The representative of the State Church (Dr. Braune is General Superintendent) naturally classes them together. On the question whether the possibility of falling from grace is here taught, see *Exeg. Notes.* The passage in Hebrews teaches either: *no fall is possible*, or: *the first fall is fatal*, an alternative not usually accepted by the advocates of such a possibility.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Comp. *Doctr. Notes.*—On vers. 22-28 (*the Epistle for the 19th Sunday after Trinity*) see the preceding section.—Virtue helps to cast off vice, and the casting off of vice introduces virtue, both thus acting reciprocally.—Two classes of men sin against the Apostle's precept respecting sinless anger: those who rage and those who can never be angry. Sinful anger is a raging storm which lays waste a planting of God's; righteous anger is a priest, who slays the sacrifice of righteousness and casts all care and anxiety from herself upon the Lord with a Hosanna. As in the Psalm (iv. 5) so here the allusion is to night, to intercourse with one's self, to quiescence about and in us; the day of anger should be the day of reconciliation; in prayer before God let all animosity be still; let not radiant love of God set for us, with the sun in the heaven. With anger we give a lodgement to the murderer of souls, the devil; who does not slay anger, him anger slays. Hot temples are the easiest bridges for the devil into our hearts.—As room can be given to the devil, so is there also a withdrawal of the Holy Ghost.—For the commonest virtues we need what is highest of all: the kindness of God in Christ; without this there is a relapse into the heathen vices.

STARKE:—Truth is a lovely virtue, a glorious ornament, and sparkles brighter than the most beautiful diamond. If you have the truth, speak the truth from your heart, and walk in the truth, then are you certainly a beloved child of God.—Anger must not be taken to bed and allowed to go to sleep with us, lest it become hatred. Where anger takes the upper hand, Christ goes down with His gracious light.—The slanderer and blasphemer has the devil on his tongue, and whoever purposely listens to the slander gets him in his ears, and whoever takes delight in it, has him in his heart.—There is no dignity, no office, in which peculations are not practised by many. It is only a pity that they are so bedecked and behung with the fine show and appearance and well-adorned cloak of right. Not only are the rich bound to have compassion on the needy, but those who maintain themselves by labor, should share with those who cannot work.—See how out of the glow of sin one spark after another rises up, each greater than the last, until a great fire is made out of it.

The enigmatical, mysterious, unfathomable, people, who never let their hearts be seen, do not bear this Divine stamp; it is as if they did not wish their evil tricks to be betrayed.—The Christian should never lay his head unreconciled to rest, and he has no rest, if he has injured any one, or knows himself to be at enmity with any one. Gentle rest belongs only to a heart free from passion. Examine thyself, whether any one sighs over thee. The Pythagoreans, if they had fallen out with each other in words, gave each other the hand before sundown, kissed each other, and were reconciled.—The aim of labor, of earning, should be the weal of others. The worth of labor is this, that it furnishes us the means of doing good and tasting the sweetness of doing good.

The perceptible alterations of life which must occur in the regenerate. 1. In general, in the prevailing mind, vers. 22-24. *a*) An entire laying off of the old evil mind, a cessation of the old lust. *b*) Putting on of an entirely new holy mind, of God's likeness, like God to think and will, and daily renewed zeal in reaching after the likeness of God. 2. Specially, vers. 25-28. Through the virtues which the renewed man exhibits: *a*) Purity, chastity. *b*) Truthfulness. *c*) Gentleness. *d*) Inoffensiveness. *e*) Honesty and Rectitude.

The great difference between Christian culture and that of the world. 1. In general. *a*) The world's culture leaves the old humanity untouched, unimproved, only whitewashes it. *b*) Christian culture ennobles man from the foundation up, by substituting the Divine mind for selfishness.

2. Specially. *a.* Culture hinders only the great outbreaks of vice, Christianity makes the heart pure. *b.* Culture teaches to shun great lies, Christianity makes inwardly true. *c.* Culture makes outwardly refined, Christianity gives true gentleness. *d.* Culture guards against coarse injustice, but Christianity makes truly honest, even where one is not remarked.—Real improvement must begin at the bottom of the heart.—Would not the world fare better, if all became real Christians?—Christians are new men.—The speech of a Christian should always have a moral purpose. Paul describes Christian eloquence both as to its matter: it speaks what is serviceable for improvement, awakens good impulses, leaves a sting behind it in the hearts of others; and as to its manner, which is to be kind, so that love is thereby expressed and made perceptible. The Christian is no babbler, does not allow himself to become a mountebank or court-fool!—The Holy Ghost can be grieved: 1. In Himself, one frustrates His work partly in his own heart, and partly in others, which especially happens through evil speeches. 2. In others, when one grieves the pious Christians, who are full of this Spirit. Consider, whom you should respect in such persons, the Holy Ghost dwelling in them!—The Christian should not be bitter, without on this account becoming sweet. Wrath is the full outbreak of hate against others. Clamor is a token of a hasty, vehement, uncontrolled, rough spirit.

PASSAVANT:—All—liars, because all, sinners, for in every sin is falsehood, a denial of the truth, a deception upon and against ourselves and before God.—Better die than lie! says an old Church Father.—In the case of the unconverted every sin is a wrong against the holy law; in the case of the converted it is at the same time a wrong against the Holy Ghost.

GERLACH:—The Holy Ghost is estranged by empty, vain babbling, but grieved by foul talk.—STIER:—To drive out every sin dwelling in the old man, the practice of the opposite virtue must be employed.—Either we slay again, or it slays us. If a man goes to bed with poison, it creeps through all his members during sleep. Anger is a murderer. Who would sleep with a murderer? To be angry is human, but to cherish it long is devilish (HEINRICH MUELLER).

[EADIE:—Ver. 26. Anger is not wholly for-

bidden; it is an instinctive principle—a species of thorny hedge encircling our birthright. But in the indulgence of it, men are very apt to sin. —"When the curfew bell rings, let us then also quench all sparks of anger and heat of passion" (THOS. FULLER).—Ver. 27. Give the devil "place" but in a point, and he may speedily cover the whole platform of the soul.—Ver. 29. Words so spoken may fall like winged seeds upon a neglected soil. Comp. Prov. xxv. 11.—Ver. 30. All this perverse insubordination is in utter antagonism to the essence and operations of Him who is the Spirit of truth, and inspires the love of it; who assumed, as a fitting symbol, the form of a dove, and creates meekness and forbearance; and who, as the Spirit of holiness, leads to the appreciation of all that is just in action, noble in sentiment, and healthful and edifying in speech. —It may be said to a prodigal son—grieve not your father lest he cast you off; or grieve not your mother lest you break her heart. Which of the twain is the stronger appeal?—Ver. 31. "Anger sets the house on fire, and all the spirits are busy upon trouble, and intend propulsion, defence, displeasure or revenge; it is a short madness, and an eternal enemy to discourse, and sober counsels, and fair conversation; it is a fever in the heart, and a calenture in the head, and a fire in the face, and a sword in the hand, and a fury all over; and therefore can never suffer a man to be in a disposition to pray" (JEREMY TAYLOR).—Ver. 32. In the exercise of Christian forgiveness his authority was their rule, and his example their model. They were to obey and also to imitate, nay, their obedience consisted in imitation.—R.]

[Ver. 25. The ground of Christian truthfulness and its negative and positive sides.—Vers. 26, 27. Anger. 1) may be right; 2) is far more likely to be wrong; 3) certainly is, if it lasts long: 4) becomes worse yet by giving entrance to the devil.—Ver. 28. Obedience here would stop many a business, and deplete the ranks of many a profession, by increasing the number of honest laborers; but how much it would do for the weal of mankind!—Legislative charity is not Christian charity, nor the payment of taxes for the support of the poor, an essentially Christian virtue.—Ver. 29. The Apostle implies here: 1. That corrupt things rise very naturally to the lips, but should never be spoken; 2. That useful things are rarer.—Much speaking is likely to be evil-speaking.—Profitable conversation: 1. How rare; 2. Little sought for; 3. Selfishness the cause.—This verse would shut many a mouth in prayer-meeting, often enough in the pulpit too.—Would that it did, for is it not by unedifying words as well as evil ones, that the Spirit is grieved?—Ver. 31. "Evil speaking," *i. e.*, slander, is "blasphemy" in Greek; it stands last in this catalogue. It always breaks the *sixth* and *ninth* commands, usually the *seventh*, and is an offence against the *third* also.—Ver. 32. Kindness is well, compassion is better, but forgiveness is like God in Christ.—Who forgave us? God in Christ; how did He forgive us? in Christ; whom did He forgive? us in Christ. —R.]

---

c. Three points of view for the new walk.

(CHAP. V. 1–14.)

1) Look above thyself to follow God!

(CHAP. V. 1, 2.)

1 Be ye [Become] therefore followers [or imitators] of God, as dear [beloved]
2 children; And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us [also loved you],[1] and hath given himself [gave himself up] for us[2] an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour [savour of sweet smell].

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 2.—[The better attested reading is ὑμᾶς (ℵ.[1] A. B., cursives, versions and fathers). The *Rec.* has ἡμᾶς (ℵ.[3] D. E. F. K. L., most cursives and versions); so Lachmann, Ellicott. See next note.—R.]

[2] Ver. 2.—[B., with some minor authorities, reads ὑμῶν instead of ἡμῶν, which is well supported. The connection with the last clause complicates the critical question however. Tischendorf, Alford and others accept: ὑμᾶς—ὑμῶν; Lachmann, Ellicott and most (*Rec.*): ἡμᾶς—ἡμῶν. If a uniformity in the person of the pronoun is indispensable, then the latter is preferable, but Braune, with Meyer and others, still more correctly accepts the variation ("loved *you* and gave himself for *us*), which is *lectio difficilior*, accounts best for the various readings, and in detail is better supported by diplomatic authority.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1, 2 *a*. *The exhortation.* **Become therefore**, *γίνεσθε οὖν*.—This connects with what precedes (iv. 34): *γίνεσθε δέ*, marking an inference, and at the same time an advance and a distinction, so that it is = *διό* (iv. 25; ii. 11; iii. 3), and like *διὰ τοῦτο* (i. 15), *τούτου χάριν* (iii. 1, 14), indicating a new section, as it does in iv. 1, 17; v. 15. Hence these verses are not to be joined to chap. iv. (SCHENKEL [HODGE]* and

* [Both EADIE and ELLICOTT seem disposed to regard the verses in this light, but ALFORD takes them as transitional, accepting the view of οὖν suggested by STIER and here upheld by Braune.—R.]

others).—**Followers** [**or imitators**] **of God**, *μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ*.—Like 1 Cor. iv. 16; xi. 1; 1 Thess. i. 6; ii. 14; Heb. vi. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 13. An injunction on the part of the Apostle to the churches, believers, to imitate what is good; we always find *γίνεσθαι*, never *εἶναι*, in this connection; thus the becoming so is marked. LUTHER, [E. V.], (be), *Vulgate* (*estote*) render incorrectly. In what sense this enormous requirement is intended is clearly indicated by the context: *condonando et amando; nam sequitur amati* (BENGEL). [Hence the word "imitators," though a literal rendering, suggests too much, and "followers" is sufficiently correct.—R.]

As beloved children [*ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπητά*].—*Ὡς*, "as," denotes the reality, *τέκνα ἀγαπητά*, "beloved children," the relation in which they are the objects of the love of God* and through Christ His children. THEODORET: *υἱοθεσίας ἠξιώθητε, πατέρα τὸν θεὸν ὀνομάζετε, ζηλώσατε τοιγαροῦν τὴν συγγένειαν.* Comp. 1 John iv. 12; iv. 7-11; Matth. v. 48: Luke vi. 36. *Liberorum est, patrem moribus referre* (GROTIUS).

Ver. 2. **And walk in love.**—*Καί*, "and," is epexegetical, in order to define the point of the imitation: *περιπατεῖτε ἐν ἀγάπῃ*, "walk in love," "even as God forgave you" (iv. 32). *Ἐν ἀγάπῃ* is God's characteristic (i. 4, 5), our aim (iii. 17-19); the former makes the latter possible. On *περιπατεῖν*, see ii. 2.

Ver. 2 *b*. *Closer designation.* **As Christ also loved you** [*καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ὑμᾶς*. See *Textual Notes*]—"In Christ" (iv. 32) is now explained. "As Christ also" binds the Christian walk to Christ and His work. Christ has loved you, in that He became man and dwelt among men, served them, being mighty in word and deed. [While "the Apostle makes no distinction between our being the objects of God's love, and our being the objects of the love of Christ" (HODGE), it is quite as true that *καί*, *also*, marks an advance "from the love of the Father who gave His Son, to that of the Son, the Personal manifestation of that love in our humanity" (ALFORD). The force of the aorists should be preserved.—R.] The *ὑμᾶς* marks the exhortation more strongly than if the reading were *ἡμᾶς*, permitting the general predicate (*ἠγάπησεν*) to become prominent in its independent validity, over against what follows:

And gave himself up for us.—*Καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτόν*, over against *ἔδωκεν* (John iii. 16) denotes two things: the voluntary giving and the giving Himself up to suffering, that is, to suffering in the general sense, including the special form, death: so has *He* loved. To this *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, "for us," also points. [The phrase in itself may or may not imply substitution; ELLICOTT and most think the context points indisputably in this case to the sense: *in our stead.*—Comp. *Romans* (v. 6), p. 164; also *Galatians* (ii. 20, and *Doctr. Notes* on iii. 6-14).—R.] The figure is taken from a conflict, in which, against the enemies thronging over a fallen one, a hero, full of noble courage and of love, protectingly contends; similar to this is the use of *περί*, which gives prominence to the being encircled by foes. This reference is found also in the closer definition which follows.

An offering and a sacrifice, *προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν*.—According to KLIEFOTH (*Liturg. Abhandlungen*, IV. p. 27 ff.) קָרְבָּן (*corban*) is the common name for all sacrifices and offerings, bloody and unbloody, while מִנְחָה (*mincha*) is principally used of the unbloody (*προσφορά*), זֶבַח (*zebach*) for the bloody offerings (*θυσία*). Comp. Heb. ix. 9; x. 5, 8, where both words occur, and x. 10, 14, 18 with x. 12, 26, where they are used promiscuously. Still even there *τοῦ σώματος* is added to *προσφορά*, so that in accordance with the context and *usus loquendi* this distinction is to be maintained, and in the given order also, because He gave Himself here as a *προσφορά*, and became in death a *θυσία*, the former being the soul of the *θυσία ζῶσα* (STIER).—[ALFORD, EADIE, ELLICOTT, all find in the former term a more general reference to the vicarious work of Christ, and in the latter a more special reference to His death. "The great prominent idea here is the *one* sacrifice, which the Son of God made of Himself in His Redeeming love, in our nature—bringing it, in Himself, near to God—offering Himself as our representative Head: whether in perfect righteousness of life, or in sacrifice, properly so called, at His death" (ALFORD).—R.] Accordingly it is not necessary to supply *εἰς θάνατον* in thought (HARLESS [HODGE], SCHENKEL and others); the context includes more.

To God for a savour of sweet smell [*τῷ θεῷ* εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας*].—This is = רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לַיהוָה (Exod. xxix. 18, LXX.: *τῷ κυρίῳ εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας*; comp. Lev. i. 9; iii. 16), where *κυρίῳ* in correspondence with the original text is placed last. Hence "to God," which is inserted for the sake of clearness, is not to be joined to the verb (MEYER). The two substantives (both derived from *ὄζω*, *ὀσμή* denoting the smell in so far as it is inhaled, and *εὐωδία* its quality, WINER, p. 562, or its effect, pleasure) give prominence to the fact that God the Father is well-pleased in the self-sacrificing love of the Crucified One, in order to strengthen, through the reference to this, the exhortation, that we too can become well-pleasing to the Father only in self-devoting love. Phil. iv. 18; Rom. xii. 1, 2; 2 Cor. ii. 15.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The *principle* and *impulse* of the Christian walk is *love*—love as it actually exists in God, who is Love in His character (1 John iv. 8), and as it has been felt and enjoyed by us who are beloved (*ἀγαπητοί*), so that we can give more and more what we have received and ever receive again. Now in Christ this love has become our portion, hence it is forgiving, reconciling, peace-

* [The point suggested by the adjective is obscured in the E. V.: "dear;" "as children *beloved*," they should imitate God in love, see ver. 2.—R.]

* [ALFORD, ELLICOTT and others prefer to connect *τῷ θεῷ* as *dat. commodi*. This alters the sense very little, and is favored by the position of the words, though the Old Testament allusion strongly sustains the view of Braune, which is accepted by many commentators. The connection with the verb is out of the question.—R.]

making; to show this in their walk is here required of Christians.

2. God is the original, Christ the express image of the Father, and the ensample of His people, the Christian the likeness and copy. As the imitation of God cannot be absolute, but is to be limited to loving, to forgiving love, so the imitation of Christ cannot be directed toward expiatory sufferings, but only to self-sacrificing love for our fellows, well-pleasing to God.

3. As we are able to walk in love only as beloved of God and as vouchsafed sonship with Him, so we can only, when reconciled to God through Christ, follow Him in filial and hence in fraternal devotion; in His grace we first can walk as well-pleasing to Him. The error of the Socinians and the Rationalists who see in Christ and His self-sacrifice a mere example and nothing more, is great and pernicious. See *Exeg.* and *Doctr. Notes* on ii. 16. As the Bible highly estimates the vicarious sufferings of Christ, which are taught, not in the ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, but in the θυσία* and the whole Scripture (Matth. xx. 28; 1 Tim. ii. 6), so it occurs in the entire life of human society: the child lives by the mother's sacrifice, and he for whom no one suffers is miserable. So we too should live for others and suffer in their stead; though we cannot make atonement, we can still live and love self-sacrificingly in the strength imparted to us.

* [EADIE remarks: "To warrant the application of the term 'sacrifice' to the death of Christ, it must have been something more than the natural, fitting, and graceful conclusion of a self-denied life—it must have been a violent and vicarious decease and a voluntary presentation." See his full doctrinal note *in loco*. At the same time ALFORD is perhaps justified in terming the question, as usually discussed, an "irrelevant one here." "It is not the death of Christ which is treated of, but the whole process of His redeeming love. His death lies in the background as one, and the chief, of the acknowledged facts of that process: but it does not give the character to what is predicated of Him." This exegetical view does not however favor any theory of the death of Christ which denies its vicarious, propitiatory character as an atoning sacrifice.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Comp. the foregoing *Doctr. Notes* and *Hom. Notes* at the close of v. 6-14.

STARKE:—Wilt thou become like God hereafter, and see Him as He is, then must thou in this life be holy, even as He is holy.—No one can rightly boast himself of sonship with God, who does not imitate Him.—Christ's example is the proper mirror in which to see the true and natural form of love.

RIEGER:—The moral instruction of the Apostles is everywhere deduced from the marrow of the gospel, nor can it be put in practice by any one who does not stand in this gospel of peace. It is the character of love, to imitate as it may the Beloved.

HEUBNER:—This is a powerful precept: who can satisfy its demands? We cannot become like Him, but we can strive to follow Him in holiness and love. Imitating Christ and God is the same thing.—Christ is and remains the original, but we should be copies, the more faithful, the better.

STIER:—The Father gives His children but one command: Love!

GERLACH:—The thank-offering Christ brought for us, that we too might now offer ourselves to God; the sin-offering, that we need not suffer the same punishment.

---

2) **Look into thyself and think of purity.**

(CHAP. V. 3-5.)

3 But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once [even]
4 named among you, as becometh saints; Neither[1] filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor
5 [or] jesting, [things] which[2] are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks. For
this ye know [of this ye are sure,[3] knowing] that no whoremonger, nor unclean
person, nor covetous man, who[4] is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom
of Christ and of [*omit* of] God.[5]

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 4.—[The best established reading as respects the particles is (*Rec.*): καί—καί—ἤ (so $\aleph^2$ B. D^3 K. L., most cursives and versions). $\aleph^1$ has ἤ instead of the second καί, while ἤ is found three times in A. D^1 F., fathers (Lachmann, Meyer, Braune), and in others καί throughout.—R.]

[2] Ver. 4.—[ℵ. A. B., 3 cursives have: ἃ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν (accepted by Lachmann, Alford. and others) instead of τά οὐκ ἀνήκοντα (*Rec.*, D. F. K. L., Meyer, Ellicott, Braune and most). The latter is well supported and *lectio difficilior*, but neither external nor internal grounds are altogether decisive.—R.]

[3] Ver. 5.—[The *Rec.* has ἔστε on the authority of D^3 K. L., but ℵ. A. B. D. F. G., 30 cursives, good versions support ἴστε, which is accepted by nearly all recent editors. The emendation above conforms to the correct reading.—R.]

[4] Ver. 5.—[The reading ὅ is found in ℵ. B., accepted by Lachmann and Alford. The *Rec.* has ὅς, which has more uncial support. In F. G. the neuter occurs with εἰδωλολατρεία, which helps to account for the change to the neuter.—R.]

[5] Ver. 5.—ℵ. B. and most: Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ. We find also θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ, Χριστοῦ θεοῦ, and simply Χριστοῦ. The first is not only better supported, but *lectio difficilior*. [The second *of* should be omitted to indicate the close connection implied in the omission of the article before θεοῦ.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The exhortation; vers. 3, 4.

Ver. 3. **But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness** [*πορνεία δὲ καὶ πᾶσα ἀκαθαρσία ἢ πλεονεξία*].—"But," *δέ*, indicates the transition to another part of the exhortation (MEYER). *Πορνεία* cannot here, where Christians are addressed, be taken in the heathen sense; the Scriptural meaning (in both Old and New Testament) is the prominent one. Hence it refers not to the coarsest exhibition, but to what is within, to the heart. It comes first as something general and comprehensive; applying to act, word, disposition, as indeed the context combines temper and walk in one, to men among themselves and in relation to God. "And all uncleanness" gives prominence to one particular side of this, pointing to every form and mode of the same. "Or covetousness" marks the other side, which is to be clearly distinguished, hence the disjunctive *ἤ**, "or," which indicates that *πᾶσα*, "all," belongs here also. The former refers to impure, unchaste, ungodly, dalliance and contact, solitary uncleanness; the latter to greedy lusting, from a distance and ungratified. This accords with iv. 19, where both substantives are found.

Let it not be even named among you, *μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν*.—Comp. ver. 12; Ps. xvi. 4. Such a thing should not even be taken up in speech, much less be done. *Ἐν ὑμῖν*=*ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν*. The prohibition is of course to be limited: *sine necessitate* (BENGEL). It is incorrect to explain: Such a thing should not be told of them, as 1 Cor. v. 1 (GROTIUS, BENGEL).

As becometh saints.—*Καθώς*, as in ver. 2; with *τρέπει ἁγίοις*, we should compare *ἀξίως* (iv. 17) and *ὁσιότης* (iv. 24), with which the introduction of such things into the speech is irreconcilable. ["Were the Apostle to say, Let despondency be banished, he might add, as becometh believers, or, Let enmity be suppressed, he might subjoin, as becometh the brethren; but he pointedly says in this place, "as becometh saints" (EADIE).—R.]

Ver. 4. **Neither filthiness,** *αἰσχρότης*.—This evidently includes more than *αἰσχρολογία* (Col. iii. 8). Although the antithesis (*εὐχαριστία*) points to shameful words (LUTHER), neither the context, which places *αἰσχρότης* beside *μωρολογία* nor the word itself require an exclusive reference to speech. Still less is it to be limited to *lewd* talk. BENGEL refers it also to *gestus, etc.*

Nor foolish talking, *καὶ μωρολογία*.—[*Textual Note* [1]. Should *ἢ* be accepted here, we should substitute *or* for *nor*, as is done in the case of the next substantive.—R.] According to the New Testament conception of *μωρός*, "fool" (Matt. v. 22; Ps. xiv. 1; liii. 2), this means godless discourse; it is not merely *stultiloquium*, insipid talk, silly babbling (CALVIN, [HODGE] MEYER, SCHENKEL). LUTHER hits the meaning with: *Narrentheidinge*, buffoonery, which denotes what is high-flown, pompous, in loose discourse. See JUETTING: *Bibl. Wörterbuch*, p. 189. [TRENCH, *Syn.* § xxxiv.: "The talk of fools, which is folly and sin together."—R.]

Or jesting, *ἢ εὐτραπελία* (from *εὖ* and *τρέπω*) means strictly *urbanitas*, a habit of cultivated people, not without adroitness and not without frivolity. LUTHER: *jest*. BENGEL aptly says: *subtilior ingenio nititur;* this refers to the form, the previous term to the purport. The *Vulgate* is incorrect: *scurrilitas*. [Comp. TRENCH, § xxxiv. on this word. He refers to "the profligate old man" of the *Miles gloriosus* (PLAUTUS), who is exactly the *εὐτράπελος*, and remarkably enough an Ephesian, boasting as though such wit were an Ephesian birthright. See also BARROW's famous sermon on wit from this text (Vol. 1, Serm. xiv.), an extract from which is given by EADIE *in loco*.—R.]

Things which are not convenient, *τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα*.—This gives prominence to the wider range, beyond the lewdness and the coarser forms. In spite of *μὴ καθήκοντα* (Rom. i. 28) we found *οὐκ* here, because the negation has coalesced with the word in one conception. See WINER, p. 452. As a predicate we must borrow an *absint* (BENGEL) from *μὴ ὀνομαζέσθω*. [This phrase is not to be limited to the last of the three substantives, but is "in apposition to the last two words, to both of which *εὐχαριστία*, as denoting oral expression yet implying inward feeling, forms a clear contrast."—R.]

But rather giving of thanks, *μᾶλλον δὲ εὐχαριστία*—*ἀνήκει*, as BENGEL aptly supplies out of the preceding context, remarking: *linguæ abusus opponitur sanctus et tamen lætus usus, vers.* 18, 19. *Non conveniunt abusus et usus εὐτραπηλία et εὐχαριστία, concinna paronomasia; illa turbat animam (et quidem subtilis aliquando jocus et lepus tenerum gratiæ sensum lædit) hæc exhilirat.** As "beloved children" they have ever again to thank God. The reference is not to grace of discourse (JEROME, CALVIN, and others, STIER includes this with the other), nor to *pudicitia* (HEINSIUS).

Ver. 5. *Special motive.* **For this ye are sure, knowing** [*τοῦτο γὰρ ἴστε γινώσκοντες*].—"For" adds a ground, in order to strengthen the exhortation as a consequence therefrom. Accordingly *ἔστε* [*ἴστε*] *γινώσκοντες* is to be taken as an indicative [MEYER, EADIE, ALFORD and others], not as imperative (*Vulgate*, LUTHER, BENGEL and others). The participle indicates the *mode* of knowing as of their own perception (MEYER), insight. *Τοῦτο*, "this," placed in advance, points to what is stated afterwards,

*["The *ἢ* is not explanatory, but has its full *disjunctive* force, serving to distinguish *πλεονεξία* from more special sins of the flesh" (ELLICOTT). On the last noun see iv. 19. "It is greed, avarice, unconquerable love of appropriation, morbid lust of acquisition, carrying in itself a violation of almost every precept of the Decalogue" (EADIE). This original notion must not be overridden by the connection with sensual sins.—R.]

*[MEYER and ELLICOTT supply *γινέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν*; EADIE suggests that *ὀνομαζέσθω* still guides the construction: "Rather let thanksgiving be named—let there be vocal expression to your grateful emotions." STIER and ALFORD follow BENGEL.—"There is a play perhaps on the similar sound of *εὐτραπελία* and *εὐχαριστία*, which may account for the latter not finding so complete a justification in the sense as we might expect: the connection being apparently, 'your true cheerfulness and play of fancy will be found, not in buffoonery, but in the joy of a heart overflowing with a sense of God's mercies.'"—ALFORD.—R.]

the import of which cannot be unknown to Christians. WINER (p. 333) is therefore incorrect: What is said in vers. 3, 4, ye know, since ye perceive, that, etc. [This reference of τοῦτο to what follows is doubtful to say the least. It seems quite correct to refer it, as the object of ἴστε, to what precedes, γινώσκοντες being joined with ὅτι. Braune takes no notice of the correct reading, an inadvertence which probably modifies his opinion of the construction. The combination of finite verb and participle is not to be explained as Hebraistic, since the verbs are different.—R.]

That no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man.—The concrete terms (πόρνος, ἀκάθαρτος, πλεονέκτης), here occurring instead of the abstract ones mentioned in ver. 3, must be taken in the same sense. [The literal sense is: "that every fornicator or (ἤ individualizes here) unclean man, or covetous man, who is an idolater, hath not inheritance." The negation is transferred to the subject according to English usage.—R.]

Who is an idolater, ὅς ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης.—This relative clause not only characterizes, but also gives a reason for the fact to be stated. On this account and because "who" is limited to the last term altogether without warrant, the clause is to be applied to "every whoremonger, unclean person, covetous man." It is not the covetous man alone who is an idolater, having this world's goods as his god (Matt. vi. 24; 1 Tim. vi. 10); Paul holds "belly" and "glory" also as "god" for the enemies of the cross (Phil. iii. 19). The proof lacks aptness, if that be not attributed to the first two, which is predicated of the third, who is not an idolater more especially than the former. The clause is incorrectly referred to the "covetous man" alone (MEYER, SCHENKEL, BLEEK); Col. iii. 5 does not prove this, still less can it be said that Paul's self-denial, which unselfishly offered up all, led him to affirm this of covetousness alone, since he was just as free from lust and uncleanness. [In this wide reference of the relative clause Braune is sustained by HARLESS, STIER and others, but the more limited view is that of EADIE, HODGE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT and most. It is more natural and obvious, since all that can be urged in favor of the other view but proves that the reference *may be* thus wide, not that it *is*. And covetousness *is* more specially idolatry, the other sins are but more subtle forms of this. If ὅ be accepted as the correct reading, then the reference is necessarily confined to the last *word*. See ALFORD *in loco*.—R.]

Hath any inheritance, οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν.—See i. 11. It is not=οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν, "shall not inherit" (Gal. v. 21; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10), nor κληρονομῆσαι οὐ δύνανται (1 Cor. xv. 50). It is the fact respecting the status; permanent, prevalent sin excludes from the kingdom of God, effects the repelling of the *arrhabo*, the Holy Ghost (i. 13, 14); "hath an inheritance" is not = inherits the kingdom, since the former marks the heirship, the latter the entrance of the heir. To accept a certain future relation viewed as present, will not suffice (BENGEL). [See WINER, p. 249. "Has no inheritance," can have none, this being a law of God's moral government of the world (EADIE, ELLICOTT), an eternal verity of that kingdom (ALFORD).—R.]

In the kingdom of Christ and God, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ.—Βασιλεία means the kingdom, where God in Christ is the Ruler, and His people belong to Him, and hence to be distinguished from ἐκκλησία, to which the fornicator and such characters belong, without having part in the former. (See *Doctr. Note* 5.) BENGEL is excellent: *articulus simplex, summam unitatem indicans.* The expression here depends on the fact that Christ's and God's kingdom is one (ver. 12), that Christ's kingdom is also God's kingdom; though this first appears at the end in glory (Rev. ix. 15), the development advancing through the Church. Accordingly it is incorrect to explain it as meaning the kingdom of Christ, who is also God (HARLESS) [HODGE and many others] though Christ is termed God (Rom. ix. 5), or can be thus termed [against MEYER].

[ALFORD: "No distinction is to be made, Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ being in the closest union. Nor is any specification needed that the kingdom of Christ is also the kingdom of God, as would be made with the second article. This follows as a matter of course: and thus the words bear no legitimate rendering, except on the substratum of our Lord's Divinity. But on the other hand we cannot safely say here that the same Person is intended by Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ, merely on account of the omission of the article. For 1) any introduction of such a predication regarding Christ would here be manifestly out of place, not belonging to the context: 2) θεός is so frequently and unaccountably anarthrous, that it is not safe to ground any such inference from its use here." So EADIE, ELLICOTT and many others. The inferential proof of the Divinity of Christ thus afforded is well-nigh as strong as, certainly more defensible than, that resulting from the other view.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The life of the Christian, like Christian ethics, must pursue sin in its coarsest forms and manifestations even into its most secret, refined propensities; it depends upon the substance; this is to be rejected in every form. Christian culture has a sharp eye and delicate perception for evil under its elegant appearance, and a powerful will and apt word for the refusal and overcoming of the same: it can have no pleasure in elegant forms under which wickedness conceals itself.

2. What was of validity in the morals of the Persians (HERODOTUS I., 138): ἅσσα δὲ σφι ποιέειν οὐκ ἔξεστι ταῦτα οὐδὲ λέγειν ἔξεστι, every Christian must accept as valid to this extent, that he says: What is more becoming to do or say, that thou shouldst not even think. A word often includes more evil in itself than an act, and a thought than a word; even if the evil thought be less mischievous than the act, because it is only a thought not an act. The sinful act of the non-christian is at all events as a rule less wicked than the Christian sinful word or temper; as the same is true of a neglected Christian child, over

against one carefully trained, or of the same man, as different now and formerly, or on festival or fast day with its elevation and in the press of labor and the throng of the world.

3. The Christian's position is dignity, which preserves the worthiness of the person in a pure life no less than in pure doctrine with tender conscientiousness.

4. Every sin stands connected with idolatry: it remains the same, whether thou makest a god of the goods of this world in covetousness, or of the lust of this world in pursuit of pleasure, or of thine own Ego in pride. Paul terms covetousness not *the* (ἡ) but *a* root (ῥίζα) of all evil (1 Tim. iv. 10). The same is true of the lust of the flesh and the pride of life (1 John ii. 16).

[HODGE is however perfectly correct in saying: "The analogy between this supreme love of riches, this service of mammon and idolatry, is more obvious and more distinctly recognized in Scripture than between idolatry and any other of the sins mentioned. It is well that this should be understood, that men should know that the most common of all sins is the most heinous in the sight of God; for idolatry, which consists in putting the creature in the place of God, is everywhere in His word denounced as the greatest of all sins in His sight. The fact that it is compatible with outward decorum, and with the respect of men, does not alter its nature. It is the permanent and controlling principle of an irreligious heart and life, turning the soul away from God. There is no cure for this destructive love of money, but using it for other than selfish purposes. Riches, therefore, must ruin their possessor, unless he employs them for the good of others and for the glory of God." —R.]

5. The *kingdom* of Christ and of God is not precisely the *church*. The former marks the authority, the latter the *people;* that refers to the *power*, which orders, manages, governs, this to the grace which chooses, attracts, trains, guides and endows; the former has to do with *powers*, which are applied and with laws which are established and administered. Both however have *one end:* God's glory and the creature's salvation. The kingdom of God and Christ is *wider* and *narrower* than the church. It stretches itself over the time *antecedent* to the church, which should become the kingdom of God, and embraces all, who obey and permit themselves to be drawn by the will of the Ruler, God in Christ, so far as the same is known, in His laws given to His creatures in nature from the very creation, in their conscience and in the order about and above them. All moral natures of every kind, childlike, truth-seeking souls belonging thereto (Matt. viii. 12; Mark xii. 34; John xviii. 36, 37). To this belong all historical leadings of nations, all guidance to individuals, all the effects of power and wisdom, which prepare the way for the church. The kingdom is God's as well as Christ's (Matt. xiii. 41; John xviii. 36 f.). As before the church and for the church the kingdom is more extended. But at the same time it becomes *less extended within* the church. There it applies to those called as the people of God, to those who obey the call; those who resist, who are indifferent, who hold only externally to the church, even though they hold in high regard a moral life, as is done without the church as well, who undervalue or despise the faith of the Scriptures or the church, or rely on the latter and neglect the former,—all withdraw themselves from the "kingdom" within the church. The word is to be taken in this latter sense here (ver. 5). At the end of the world both come together: since that will be the *fulness* of time, when the Son of man shall appear in glory.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Comp. *Doctr. Notes.*

From the wanderings of the flesh in the insubordination of its appetites and of society in loose talk, we should take occasion, not to run away and forsake the world, but to guard ourselves and so to strive in ourselves, that God's pardoning love is not in vain, and sanctification is not disturbed. Neither happiness, nor pleasure, nor property is the aim and task of life, but the formation of the character, of that stamp with His image received in creation and renewed in redemption. To be covetous in what is noblest, to be impure in what is most exalted, to be disorderly in what is spiritual and heavenly is an abomination of abominations. Such a condition excludes from God and God's kingdom, in the Church, its service and government. Take heed to that, teacher and preacher. Be mindful of it always in prayer and public service.

STARKE:—In Christianity exact bounds are placed upon our words, far more so than is done by mere reason; Matt. xii. 36. Hear this, ye buffoons! ye cannot boast yourselves of Christianity.—You betray by this too well the bottom of your yet unsanctified hearts.—Could we find a register of those whom God as a just Judge will exclude from heaven, the first place as a rule would be given to those who break the Seventh Commandment.

RIEGER:—The world often gives its uncleanness the name of love-affairs; but the word love in the Scriptures is far too good to be applied to any such things.

HEUBNER:—No man has such a horror of all sins of the flesh as the Christian; his destiny, his fellowship, his Exemplar, his future inheritance, all require him to be pure.—Paul describes the Christian's propriety in speech, distinguishing three kinds of obnoxious talk: 1. Such as offends and injures the sense of virtue, that is, impure, indecent, shameless talking; 2. Such as opposes the reason and offends the sense of truth, that is, foolish, silly, senseless, insipid talking; 3. Such as hinders religious earnestness, designed only to raise a laugh.—Every prevailing sin removes us from God. The covetous commit idolatry with their money, the lustful with their flesh. If then it be asked which is more compatible with religion, a disposition to lust or avarice, the latter seems less reconcilable. The covetous man imagines, because he perhaps restrains himself from many vices, that he is better, and covetousness as something relative is more difficult to recognize.—The kingdom of Christ is the medium and condition of the king

dom of God; through Christ the kingdom of God becomes predominant. The kingdom of Christ, in so far as it is an external institution, yields to the kingdom of God.

PASSAVANT:—The Greeks loved a fine joke, seasoned and adorned with wit and grace. But under the jest and its elegant dress, an impure and low sense was often concealed.—Look, wit is a dangerous gift, and to give it play brings discomfort and pain.

STIER:—The worst in front, the obscenities, *double entendres;* there are also obscenities of mammon, nastinesses arising from pride and worldliness, for which the Holy Ghost has the same aversion in His saints.

[EADIE:—Into Christ's kingdom the fornicator and sensualist cannot come; for, unsanctified and unprepared, they are not susceptible of its spiritual enjoyments, and are filled with antipathy to its unfleshly occupations; and specially into God's kingdom "the covetous man, who is an idolater," cannot come, for that God is not his God, and disowning the God of the kingdom, he is self-excluded. As his treasure is not there, so neither there could his heart find satisfaction and repose.—R.]

3) Look about thyself and be independent and benevolent!

(CHAP. V. 6–14.)

6 Let no man [no one] deceive you with vain [empty] words: for because of these
7 things cometh the wrath of God upon the children [sons] of disobedience. Be
8 not ye [Become not] therefore partakers[1] with them. For ye were sometime [once
ye were] darkness, but now *are ye* light in the Lord: walk as children of light;
9 (For the fruit of the Spirit [light][2] *is* in all goodness and righteousness and
10, 11 truth;) Proving what is acceptable unto [well-pleasing to] the Lord. And
have no fellowship[3] with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather [even] re-
12 prove *them*. For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of
them in secret [For the things done in secret by them it is a shame even to speak
13 of].[4] But all things that are [being] reproved are made manifest by the light: for
whatsoever doth make manifest [everything which is made manifest][5] is light.
14 Wherefore he saith, Awake [or Up!][6] thou that [who] sleepest, and arise from the
dead, and Christ shall give thee light.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 7.—[Here as so frequently in compounds with συν in Paul's Epistles, συνμέτοχοι is better supported than the usual and more euphonic συμμέτοχοι (*Rec.*). The former is found in ℵ. A. B.[1] D.[1] F. G., accepted by Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott and many recent editors.—R.]

[2] Ver. 9.—[The reading of the *Rec.:* πνεύματος, is supported by D.[3] K. L., most cursives and some fathers, but is now generally rejected as a gloss from Gal. v. 22, φωτός being sustained by ℵ. A. B. D[1] F., good cursives, Syriac and other versions, Latin fathers.—The parenthesis is to be retained, see *Exeg. Notes.*—R.]

[3] Ver. 11.—[Συνκοινωνεῖτε (ℵ. A. B.[1] D.[1] F. G. L., Tischendorf, Ellicott).—R.]

[4] Ver. 12.—The E. V. has unnecessarily transposed the order in this verse. A literal rendering would be: "For the things which in secret come to pass by them it is shameful to speak of."—R.]

[5] Ver. 13.—[These alterations are required by the views expressed in the *Exeg. Notes*, and may be accepted as indicating in general the opinions of recent commentators.—R.]

[6] Ver. 14.—The *Rec.* reads ἔγειραι (Lachmann], which has no uncial support. Ἔγειρε is accepted by nearly all recent editors and commentators, since it occurs in ℵ. A. B. D. F. K. L., and other authorities.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 6. *The transition.* **Let no one deceive you with empty words,** *μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς ἀπατάτω κενοῖς λόγοις.*—The precept: "let no one deceive you," is entirely general, but limited by the context to social intercourse; there being nothing to indicate a further extension. Hence "no one" is to be applied to members of the Church and the non-christians who are, or come, near them; "deceive" including unintentional as well as intentional leading astray. Accordingly the reference is not, as in Col. ii. 8, to philosophers and Jewish errorists (GROTIUS), nor merely to frivolous Christians (OLSHAUSEN), or to those heathen who had remained unbelieving (MEYER). The loquacious persons spoken of are false teachers with "empty words." This phrase means discourse wanting in truth, life and spirit; *hoc genus est, species tres* ver. 4. (BENGEL). [ALFORD: "Empty—not containing the kernel of truth, of which words are but the shell—words with no underlying facts."—R.] Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 33. BULLINGER: *Erant apud Ephesios homines corrupti, ut hodie apud nos plurimi sunt, qui hæc salutaria Dei præcepta cachinno excipientes obstrepunt: humanum esse, quod faciunt amatores, utile, quod fœneratores, facetum, quod jaculatores, et ideirco Deum non usque adeo graviter animadvertere in istius modi lapsus.** STIER is not altogether incorrect in find-

* ["The Apostle generally condemns all apologists for vice, whoever they might be. They would of course be most commonly found among the heathen, and to them the passage most naturally points. The palliation or tacit toleration of

ing an ironical opposition in: ἀπατᾷν κενοῖς, exhorting thus: let them speak only in vain (1 Cor. xv. 14, 58).

For because of these things, διὰ ταῦτα γάρ, introduces a reason; "because of these things" pointing beyond the genus ("empty word") to the species (ver. 4), just as in the parallel passage, Col. iii. 6 (δι' ἅ). [The context is decisive against the reference either to the ἀπάτῃ of the "empty words," or to this and the sins mentioned in ver. 4. See ELLICOTT and ALFORD.—R.]—**Cometh**, ἔρχεται, marks the fact as present, like "hath not" (ver. 5); it is neither=*venire solet* (ERASMUS), nor a general asseveration without any temporal qualification (HARLESS), nor does it point to the future (MEYER, SCHENKEL, BLEEK); the punishment has *already begun*. See Rom. i. 18.

The wrath of God, ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ.—This also is not to be considered as quiescent until the final Judgment. It already comes both externally and internally as correction and punishment, **upon the sons of disobedience**, ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας (ii. 2).—This designates more strongly than ἀπειθεῖς those who still or again oppose God and His word within the Church. ["The active and practical side of the ἀπειθῶν (John iii. 36) is here brought out. The word is a valuable middle term between unbelief and disobedience, implying their identity in a manner full of the highest instruction" (ALFORD).—R.]

Warning against association with wicked men; vers. 7-10.

Ver. 7. **Become not therefore**, μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε.—Οὖν, "therefore," marks the specializing of the warning and that it rests on "the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience" as its basis, while γίνεσθε, "become," indicates that this state of things is not yet present, and at the same time the danger of its entrance and its quiet, unnoticed and unregarded development.* Vulgate: *Nolite effici!* BENGEL: *Ne ira super vos veniat!*

Partakers with them, συνμέτοχοι† αὐτῶν, *i. e.* with the sons of disobedience. It is inappropriate to refer αὐτῶν to vices (SCHENKEL), and to understand συνμέτοχοι (iii. 6) of the portion of the wicked (KOPPE, STIER, who includes this also). The reference to the punishment is the foundation of the warning against companionship with them.

Ver. 8 presents *a new reason*, taken from their experience of grace, their grasp on the Lord and their task: **For once ye were**,* ἦτε γάρ ποτε!—That is, thanks to God, it is past! Hence ἦτε stands emphatically first; and LUTHER with his *weiland* [=to the antique "sometime" of the E. V.] aptly recalls a past condition, referring to a new life.—**Darkness**, σκότος, *abstractum pro concreto, emphasi egregia* (BENGEL). [They were not only living or abiding in it, but themselves actual and veritable darkness (ELLICOTT).—R.]

But now are ye light in the Lord, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ.—This, without ἐστι, is quite as emphatic and brief. "Light," as in 1 John i. 5; John viii. 12, is a comprehensive designation of the Divine life and character, both ethical and intellectual in its meaning, in contrast with darkness (iv. 18; Acts xxvi. 18; Col. i. 12, 13; 1 Pet. ii. 9). These nominatives emphasize the being full, permeated by, and are stronger than ἐν σκότει (Rom. ii. 19; 1 Thess. v. 4), ἐν φωτί. [Comp. USTERI, *Lehrbegr.* ii. 1, 3, p. 229, on the terms φῶς and σκότος.—HODGE weakens the sense into "enlightened," but "light" has here an active sense, which prepares the way for the subsequent exhortation, since they were not only to walk worthy of the light but be light to others (ver. 13).—R.] The added phrase, ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ, excludes the notion of having earned the present condition, marking the operation of the Lord, in order to excite thankfulness for constancy, fear of apostacy and backsliding, without the ability of helping one's self.

Walk as children of light, ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς† περιπατεῖτε.—The status is marked by ὡς, "as." What ye are ("children of light"), be in deed and truth ("walk")! Energetically added, without any conjunction, as growing out of what precedes, as its result.

Ver. 9. **For the fruit of the light**, ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός.—This is introduced as a ground (γάρ). The children of the light are referred to the fruit of the light, in order to excite them to a corresponding walk. This fruit consists **in all goodness and righteousness and truth** [ἐν πάσῃ ἀγαθωσύνῃ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ].—"Fruit" is in the singular, and yet three terms follow, as in Gal. v. 22: "the fruit of the Spirit" is followed by nine, in order to render prominent its unity in contrast with "the works of the flesh" (ver. 19 ff.) in their sundered character, their opposition to each other.

Goodness, ἀγαθωσύνη, the opposite of which is κακία, is distinguished from χρηστότης, which is mentioned in connection with it (Gal. v. 22), in this, that it refers to the depth of the disposition, χρηστότης more to the character of its manifestation; both denoting goodness however. Here are designated the character and conduct as regards possessions of every kind,

vice, especially sensuality, was one of the most fearful and repulsive features of heathenism; see specifically Tholuck, *Influence of heathenism*, Part iv. 2."—ELLICOTT. Comp. the citation from Whitby and Gauthey in EADIE. The "vain words" were publicly spoken then, now they come in more concealed form, but the same lies are uttered still on the same subject and with like result, immediate and ultimate.—R.]

* [The force of γίνεσθε is not to be explained away. ALFORD indeed strongly objects to it here as unnecessary and unsuitable, but he seems to entertain a prejudice against it. A German from his familiarity with the distinction between *Sein* and *Werden* in his own language is usually delicate in his perception of the same distinction in other languages.—R.]

† [See *Textual Note* [1] for the authority in favor of thus spelling the word.—R.]

* [This order seems to bring out the emphasis best. Comp. HARLESS and ELLICOTT in justification of the omission of μεν here (against RUECKERT).—R.]

† [The absence of the article with φωτός is regarded by ALFORD as significant: "here it is light, *as light*, which is spoken of." ELLICOTT however thinks the omission is due to the principle of correlation: "if the governing noun is without the article, the governed will be equally so."—R.]

which one has and knows another to stand in need of.

Righteousness, *δικαιοσύνη*, the opposite of which is *ἀδικία*, respects relations and the ordering of the same, claims which can be made, and obligations, which should be fulfilled, and is just in regard to all these, taking pains that nothing, neither the least nor the most difficult, receives detriment.

Truth, *ἀλήθεια*, the opposite of which is *ψεῦδος*, concerns the agreement of what is internal and external, of thought and word and deed, of goodness and righteousness, so that one is not served at the expense of the other, and harmony exists. The terms are not to be divided according to the three categories: inwardly, toward man, toward God (B-CRUSIUS), or source, outwardly, inwardly (SCHENKEL).* "All," *πάσῃ*, denotes the extent of the manifold manifestations (Phil. iv. 6: *ὅσα*), it is not then=all kinds. Others explain differently, but it is generally agreed, that *ἐστι* or *συνέστηκε* should be supplied. [Comp. WINER, p. 173, against the acceptance of a Hebraism here (*ἐν=Beth essentiæ*, Gesenius, *Lexicon*, under ב, C).—R.]

Ver. 10. **Proving**, *δοκιμάζοντες*.—Grammatically this participle may be the mode of the walking, ver. 9 being taken as a parenthesis. So BENGEL, HARLESS, MEYER, SCHENKEL [HODGE, EADIE, ELLICOTT, ALFORD], and others. But the exhortation may also be regarded as concluded in ver. 8; nor does ver. 9 give in the main the impression of being a parenthesis, while the participle can be, according to WINER (p. 545), taken imperatively with *ἐστε* supplied, as occurs at least ten times in Rom. xii. 9-13. So KOPPE, STIER, BLEEK and others. [Such a construction is certainly allowable, where the context plainly requires it, but is not to be accepted when a simpler view is so obviously suggested as in this case.—R.] The former view is favored by the connection of "proving" and "walk," since through the walk as a child of the light material and power for the proof grows and ripens. [On the word see TRENCH, *Syn.*, II. § xxiv.—R.] Investigation and discrimination are required of the children of light; independently, not "tossed as waves and carried about—in the sleight of men" (iv. 14), they should prove, **what is well-pleasing to the Lord**, *τί ἐστιν εὐάρεστον τῷ κυρίῳ*.—"What," *τί*, defines that all things, even the most refined traits and forms, are to be proved. The question is, Is it "well-pleasing to the Lord," *i. e.*, to Christ, who with His Word is the objective measure. ["The Christian's whole course is a continual proving, testing of the will of God in practice: investigating not what pleases himself, but what pleases Him" (ALFORD).—R.] Comp. Rom. xiv. 23; xii. 2; 2 Cor. v. 9; 1 Thess. v. 21.

Warning against fellowship with evil works; vers. 11-13.

Ver. 11. **And have no fellowship**, *καὶ μὴ συνκοινωνεῖτε*.—"And" connects the imperative with the similar admonition, ver. 7, there "with them" is added, here "with the works," the latter referring to fellowship with the works, the former with the persons The verb is a strengthened form* (Phil iv. 14, Rev. xviii. 4), from *συγκοινωνός* (Rom xi. 17; 1 Cor. ix 23, Phil. i. 7; Rev. i. 9); it is a compound not usual with the Apostle, denoting however the fellowship on one side alone. Hence *συν* is not to be referred to the disobedient, and *κοινωνεῖν* to the works (MEYER).

With the unfruitful works of darkness [*τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρποις τοῦ σκότους*].—The prominent word *ἔργοις*, "works," is followed by *ἀκάρποις*, "unfruitful," distinguished by the article, in contrast to: "the fruit of the light" (ver. 9).† The expression is not without a certain mildness, like "empty words" (ver. 6), yet without being weak, simply denying the fruit, without positively referring to the corruption and condemnation (iv. 22; Rom. vi. 21; viii. 13; Gal. vi. 8). The expressions: "dead works" (Heb. vi. 1; ix. 14), "wicked works" (Col. i. 21), are similar. The added genitive: *τοῦ σκότους*, "of darkness," appends the positive element (Rom. xiii. 12); Gal. v. 19: *τῆς σαρκός*.

But rather even reprove them.—*Non satis abstinere est* (BENGEL); hence *μᾶλλον δὲ καί*, "but rather even." Lev. xix. 17. *Ἐλέγχετε* requires rebuke, punishment, conviction, as in John iii. 20; xvi. 8 The object is not expressed; but the context supplies it: *αὐτά* (them, *i. e.* the works). The mode is determined by the context, since the evil works are to be punished: through proper conduct in word and work, *verbis et factis luce dignis* (BENGEL). MEYER and SCHENKEL incorrectly apply it to oral rebuke alone, against the passages in John, from which an oral conviction and punishment cannot be deduced. Comp. John viii. 9. The result: conversion, improvement, is in no way indicated, hence not to be accepted (OLSHAUSEN).

[ALFORD, EADIE and ELLICOTT favor the reference to oral rebuke; certainly it seems a prominent thought, but see on the next verse. The last named author thus marks the antithesis: "Do not connive at them or pass them over unnoticed, but take aggressive measures against them; try and raise the Gentiles to your own Christian standard." HODGE takes the verb as meaning: to convince by evidence, deducing from this statement: "The ethics as well as the theology of the Bible are founded on the principle that knowledge and holiness, ignorance and sin, are inseparable." Hence that our duty is simply to let "the light of Divine truth shine into the darkened minds of men, and upon their evil deeds."—R.]

Ver. 12. **For the things done in secret by them it is a shame even to speak of.**—

* [MEYER properly observes that these three words present the whole of Christian morality under its three aspects, the good, the right, the true. It may be added that this verbal triad, presenting the one fruit of the light is less sentimental, but more substantial than the hackneyed cluster of words: the true, the beautiful, the good. "The right" too often gives way to "the beautiful," so-called.—R.]

* [De Wette's rendering: "take no part in," would require a genitive after the verb; the other is more literal, and is now accepted by EADIE, who at first followed DE WETTE.—R.]

† [Comp. especially Gal. v. 19, 22, where there is a similar contrast, on which JEROME remarks: *vitia in semetipsa finiuntur et pereunt, virtutes frugibus pullulant et redundant.*—R.]

[See *Textual Note* [4]]. Evidently a reason (γάρ) for what was said in ver. 11 is here introduced. BENGEL correctly indicates one part of it: *cur indefinite loquatur ver.* 11 *de operibus tenebrarum, quum fructum lucis ver.* 9 *definite descripserit*,* the other is at any rate, why he has expressed himself so briefly, generally, without qualification: ἐλέγχετε. It is incorrect to take γάρ=although (KOPPE), or to insert "although" (RUECKERT).—Τὰ γάρ κρυφῆ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν, *i. e*, the children of disobedience (ver. 6), or "those doing the works of darkness" (WINER, p 134), can only be the works mentioned before, but more definitely characterized, in order to give a motive for the propriety of the requirement. Two elements now brought forward, constitute the characteristics of these works: κρυφῆ, "in secret," the main point standing first, and γινόμενα the second. The former marks the works as those to which ever clings something unknown, unrecognized, that may not appear, but will remain in concealment, ashamed of itself however bold; the latter, which is not =ποιούμενα, marks their involuntary, habitual character, not isolated but peculiar, while ὑπό expresses the guilt of those who do them. STIER aptly compares with our passage the profound description of the "rebels against the light" (מֹרְדֵי־אוֹר, Job xxiv. 13-16) and "the hidden things of darkness" (1 Cor. iv. 5; John iii. 20, 21); accordingly it is not to be referred exclusively to sins of debauchery, orgies [HOLZHAUSEN] and the like, although these are included; nor are we to understand only heathen sins of the most objectionable character. The works of darkness are stretched in a way that is universally and continuously valid; of such works "it is a shame even to speak" (vers. 3, 4). Evidently λέγειν is not merely narration, indifferent mention, but includes disapproving, rebuking mention as well. Paul requires an ἐλέγχειν without a λέγειν, "without one's taking all their dirt into his mouth" (*Berlb. Bible*), hence through the walk in word and work, so necessary on this account. Matt. v. 16; Phil. ii. 15.

[The main difficulty here is the question of connection. The views of BENGEL and KOPPE have been already suggested, and seem unsatisfactory. That of Braune (so STIER, PEILE, BLOOMFIELD, following THEOPHYLACT and ERASMUS) depends on the meaning of ἐλέγχετε, and since this seems to include verbal reproof, the restriction here is at least improbable. HARLESS and others connect the verse with "have no fellowship," but this identifies "works of darkness" and "things done in secret" almost too strongly, and as ELLICOTT suggests, gives undue prominence to the negative part of the command, while the phrase "but rather even," as well as the subsequent context makes "reprove" the leading thought. Taking ἐλέγχετε in its proper sense, and accepting the connection of this verse with it by γάρ, two views present themselves: that of ALFORD and others: "I mention not and you need not *speak* of these deeds—much less have any fellowship with them—your connection with them must be only that which the act of ἔλεγξις necessitates:" and that of MEYER, ELLICOTT, EADIE and others: "By all means reprove them, and there is the more need of it, for it is a shame even to speak of their secret sins." This is preferable, and the reproof of the works of darkness can take place without speaking of the more disgusting forms.—R.]

Ver. 13. **But all things**, τὰ δὲ πάντα, denotes what is described in ver. 12. [So MEYER, ELLICOTT and others against RUECKERT and ALFORD, who take the phrase as of general application.—R.]—**Being reproved are made manifest by the light**, ἐλεγχόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανεροῦται.—The light is God's, in His Word, in our conscience, character and conduct; the Christian persons falling into the back-ground behind the "light" which works in and out from them: this must work for its own sake, the efficiency does not enter with reference to our persons. Hence ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός belongs both to ἐλεγχόμενα and φανεροῦται, as the position indicates also, since otherwise it would be repeated. In ἐλεγχόμενα the success of the ἐλέγχετε is set forth: you do not proceed ineffectually against the works of the children of disobedience, they are rebuked, struck, could not avoid it; your light has become a punishment for them. When this takes place, they are made manifest, what is "in secret" in them, becomes plain and its scandalousness is recognized; ἐλεγχόμενα is therefore a presupposition to φανεροῦται, not an extension of the predicate, but a limitation of the subject, τὰ πάντα. The context however suggests: the reproved acts or conditions become so to the possessor: to him they are now manifest as reproved, as reproved with right, and both reproved and manifested through the light of the truth in Jesus Christ and His people.

[It seems to be an unsatisfactory way out of the difficulty respecting the connection of ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός, to join it to both the participle and the verb, and Braune is probably led to adopt it by his desire to maintain the thought of a tacit reproof. To join it with the participle (DE WETTE and others) is open to objection, for this gives the ἐλέγχειν a specification not in accordance with ver. 12, while, equally with Braune's view, it makes φῶς entirely too ethical, it being properly metaphorical in both clauses. The connection with the verb is more natural, "by the light" receiving emphasis from the order in the Greek. So MEYER, ELLICOTT, EADIE and most recent commentators. The participle is a predication of manner or time ("being reproved," or "when reproved") joined to the subject. See note at the close of the verse.—R.]

For everything which is made manifest is light.—Πᾶν τὸ φανερούμενον, following φανεροῦται, is passive (WINER, p. 242); all, that is illuminated, made manifest, φῶς ἐστιν, itself gives light, has the nature and efficiency of light. This very general proposition is limited by the character of the subject (BENGEL: *sermo de homine ipso*, ver. 14), to the persons who permit themselves to be reproved, who must

* [So ŒCUMENIUS, BAUMGARTEN, MATTHIES, but the Apostle was not apt to pause thus in his rebuke of sin; comp. Rom. i. 24–32; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 20; Gal. v. 19–21; 1 Tim. i. 9, 10.—R.]

permit themselves to be enlightened, in order to become manifest, shined upon and illuminated, and finally to become themselves light. BENGEL: *Antanaclasis; nam φανεροῦται est passivum; φανερούμενον medium, quod manifestari non refugit.* With STIER we may find here a recalling of: "once ye were darkness, now are ye light" (ver. 8), in order that in thankfulness and mildness towards those in the same condition in which they formerly were, they may apply the reproving and manifesting walk. Because what is shined upon, illuminated, itself shines, walk then so, that ye shame, reprove, convince those who are busy with the works of darkness, bringing them to the light; thus ye will best help them, as ye yourselves have been helped. The first part of this verse indicates the immediate result, the second the end of the ἐλεγχθῆναι or ἐλέγχειν. BENGEL: *Simul hinc patet facilitas* (STIER: because without speaking, hence without special knowledge of him who is to be reproved), *justitia* (STIER: because to the darkness the judging light is of right due), *salubritas* (STIER: because these can thus become light themselves) *elenchi.*—There is here no reference to the Gnostic light-theory of the Valentinians (BAUR), since these on the contrary wrested and distorted this passage after A. D. 150. Quite as untenable and inapt are those explanations which take φανερούμενον as active and πᾶν as the object—accusative (GROTIUS), or apply the ἐλέγχειν only to oral rebuke (MEYER, SCHENKEL and others), or regard the neuter as masculine merely (STORR and others).

[The view of MEYER is on the whole most satisfactory: "*But all things* (all those secret sins), *when they are reproved*, when that ἐλέγχετε has been effected on them, *are made manifest by the light*, by the light of Christian truth, which is efficient in your reproving, are brought to light as to their true moral quality, unveiled and made clear to the moral consciousness; *by the light*, I say, they are made manifest, *for*—in order to prove by a general proposition, that this cannot take place except by the light—*all that which is made manifest*, that is brought out of its concealment and brought to light in its true character, *is light*, has thus ceased to have the nature of darkness and is now of the *character of light*. The basis of this proof is the syllogism: "*Quod est in effectu* (φῶς ἐστί), *id debet in causa* (ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός)." This is equally simple and grammatical. It avoids the common mistake of referring the words too definitely. Commentators have run into much perplexity by not accepting occasional general propositions; comp. Gal. iii. 20. EADIE, following CALVIN and others, still maintains an active or middle sense, objecting to the passive that light does not always exercise this transforming influence. But this objection holds only against a too strictly ethical sense of φῶς, to which OLSHAUSEN, STIER, HODGE (and Braune) incline. Objectively taken, it is universally true: "*everything shone upon is* LIGHT." "Whether this tends to condemnation or otherwise, depends on the nature of the case, and the inward operation of the outwardly illuminating influence" (ALFORD, ELLICOTT). See the last named for a clear statement, and comp. HARLESS, EADIE, but especially MEYER *in loco*.—R.]

The conclusion; ver. 14.

Ver. 14. **Wherefore he saith** [διὸ λέγει; Braune: *It is said:* comp. iv. 8.—R.]—"Wherefore" refers to what precedes, and in accordance with the purport of the citation, to all that is said of the walk in the light, not merely to ver. 13 (SCHENKEL), but to vers. 8, 11 also, in order to render the exhortation more complete and forcible through a citation.* Hence λέγει is as in iv. 8. This quotation of the Apostle is not to be weakened, because no corresponding passage is found in the Old Testament, neither Isa. lx. 12 (CALVIN and most) nor xxvi. 19 (BEZA and others) nor lii. 1, 2, or ix. 1; it is not supposed that he cited a saying given directly to him (JEROME) or an apocryphal passage (MORUS and others). Certainly we should not accept a *lapsus memoriæ*, as though he wished to quote from canonical Scripture and happened on an apocryphal passage that could not be authenticated (MEYER, who compares 1 Cor. ii. 9), and quite as little a combination of the passages from Isaiah (SCHENKEL, who refers to Rom. ix. 33; xi. 8, 26).† Least of all is λέγει=φησί, they said, it is said (BORNEMANN). The most probable explanation is, that it is a quotation from a Christian hymn that had grown out of Isa. x. 1, 2. This is confirmed by vers. 18, 19, as well as by the significance of church hymns beside the Scripture. So THEODORET with reference to 1 Cor. xiv. 26; SEVERIANUS in Tischendorf (ed. 7, vol. ii. p. 457). BENGEL: *Simul videtur in mente habuisse formulam, quæ in festo buccinarum adhiberi solita fuerat. Et fortasse illo anni tempore scripsit hanc epistolam.* 1 Cor. v. 7. BLEEK *in loco* and *Stud. und Krit.* 1853, p. 331. STIER and others: A word of God is introduced as speaking to the Christian.

[There is one insuperable objection to these views of Braune, STIER, BENGEL, BORNEMANN, as well as to those of RHENFERD (one of our Lord's unrecorded sayings), WESLEY (the general tenor of Scripture), BARNES (who sees no reason for accepting a quotation at all), and that is Paul's use of λέγει, his formula of citation from the *Old Testament;* especially in conjunction with διό. If we accept a Christian hymn based on the passage in Isaiah the difficulty is not removed, but the way opened for the multiplication of difficulties. If God speaks, (as Braune implies) through a paraphrase in the form of a Christian hymn, much more does he speak, when His Apostle interprets or applies His written word. The best solution is that of ALFORD:

* [ALFORD explains: "Seeing that everything that is made manifest becomes light—is shone upon by the detecting light of Christ—objectively—it only remains that the man should be shone upon *inwardly* by the same Christ revealed in his awakened heart. We have then in Scripture an exhortation to that effect."—R.]

† [The German has an obvious typographical error. It reads *Johanneischen Stellen*, passages from John. SCHENKEL really defends the view, "that the Apostle has freely combined several Scriptural passages in accordance with their sense and from memory," suggesting Isa. lii. 1; xxvi. 19; lx. 1. This view is favored though not definitely adopted by HODGE and EADIE. Undoubtedly, the Apostle combines passages (Rom. ix. 33; xi. 8, 26), but not so loosely. We may defend either a quotation according to the sense, or a literal combination, not both, especially in connection with the notion of free quotation from memory. Paul interpreted the Scriptures, whose words he well knew; a *lapsus memoriæ* was scarcely possible in his case as a man, much less as an inspired man.—R.]

"In the first place, by the introduction of ὁ Χριστός, it is manifestly *a paraphrase, not an exact citation*. The Apostle cites, and had a perfect right to cite, the language of prophecy: and that he is here doing so, the bare word '*Christ*' shows us beyond dispute. I insist upon this, that it may be plainly shown to be no shift in a difficulty, no hypothesis among hypotheses—but the *necessary* inference from the form of the citation. This being so—of what passage of the Old Testament is this a paraphrase? I answer of Isa. lx. 1, 2. There, the Church is set forth as being in a state of darkness and of death (comp. lix. 10), and is exhorted to awake, and become light, for that her light is come, and the glory of Jehovah has arisen upon her. Where need we go further for that of which we are in search?" —The view of ELLICOTT is similar: "St. Paul, speaking under the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is expressing in a condensed and summary form the spiritual meaning of the passage." He thinks the prophet's immediate words supply in substance the first part of the quotation, while the latter part is the spiritual application of the remainder of the verse, and of the general tenor of the prophecy. ALFORD's view is safe, and rests on the Lord's own saying: "Search the Scriptures, they are they which testify of me" (John v. 39).—R.]

Up! thou who sleepest, *ἔγειρε ὁ καθεύδων*.—[The word *ἔγειρε* is not the active for the middle but is the common form of rousing (FRITZSCHE).—R.]—This can be addressed only to the Christian (Rom. xiii. 11, 12), who at God's call opens his eyes; the Lord has come to him, awakened him, so that he, awake and alive, looks about him. [It is more correct to regard this as addressed to those who are not yet Christians, but about to become so through the effectual call of God.—This is perhaps Braune's view, see *Doctr. Note* 3.—R.] The beginning of knowledge is thus denoted. Still there is yet a struggle with sleep; the eyes close again; the light of day dazzles.—**And arise from the dead**, *καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*, is the advance to rising from the couch, standing up and preparing for work. *Ἀναστῆναι ἐπὶ ἔργον ἐγερθῆναι ἐξ ὕπνου.* The sleeper is inactive, as one who is dead.—The promise incites: **and Christ shall shine upon thee**, *καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός*.—The figure is that of the morning, when day breaks and man meets the sun and daylight. Christ is the light, makes the day that shines upon and enlightens us, in order that we may become light for others, as the context requires. On the forms *ἀνάστα* and *ἐπιφαύσει* see WINER, pp. 76, 85.

[The question of the connection of this verse deserves some further attention. Braune apparently follows STIER, who thinks the quotation is introduced to exhort: "Become light, that ye may be able to convict others," which accords with his view of silent reproof. But this seems to be stepping aside from the more obvious sense. HODGE takes it as a confirmation of the assertion of the preceding verse: everything made manifest is light. This is true, but scarcely a sufficient reason for its introduction. MEYER paraphrases *διό* thus: Because the reproof is so necessary, as I have indicated in ver. 12, and so wholesome in its effects as shown in ver. 13, *therefore, etc.*, and then says that the call of God confirms the *necessity* of the reproof, and the promise: "Christ shall shine upon thee," supports the *wholesome influence of the light*, under which the reproof places them. This seems preferable. So that the purpose of the Apostle is to show by a paraphrase from the Scriptures that the effect of the light is such, and that therefore Christians should reprove in order that others may become light through the illumination here promised. In general what is made manifest is light (ver. 15), but Christ's shining makes new light in a spiritual sense. Let your light shine, so as to reprove, in the hope that Christ will shine on the convicted heart. This seems to be the view of ALFORD, and is approached by ERASMUS and RUECKERT.—R.]

What JEROME says is interesting: *scio me audisse quendam de hoc loco in ecclesiam disputantem—testimonium hoc, inquit, ad Adam dicitur in loco calvariæ sepultum, ubi crucifixus est dominus,—illo ergo tempore quo crucifixus dominus super ejus pendebat sepulchrum, hæc prophetia completa est:* surge, Adam, qui dormis et exsurge a mortuis et *non ut legimus ἐπιφαύσει σοι Χριστός, i. e.*, orietur tibi Christus, *sed ἐπιψαύσει, i. e.*, contingent te Christus, *quia videlicet tactu sanguinis ipsius et corporis dependentis vivificetur atque consurgat.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. One of the weightiest points in the formation of the Christian life is the *conversation* and intercourse with others, the *social life*. Here foresight and circumspection are necessary. Sociality is a gift and has a task, and both of these are twofold: Every one has both for himself and others. *For himself*, that he does not suffer detriment through the idle, flat, empty, useless character of the same. There may enter a somnolence of the awakened Christian impulse and life, of moral endeavor, of zeal in sanctification, through dissipation, gossipping, amusement and jesting, or excitement of carnal zeal, dainty, proud and high-flown character, onesidedness and injustice in opinion and conduct. *For others*, that he promotes their advancement, and in the interchange of sentiment and experience elevates, confirms, clarifies, rectifies, and complements them. Do not enter into more intimate intercourse with him, who cannot and will not be to you what you ought to be to him, or guard against his influence over you, taking heed if you cannot alter him, that you do not at all events conform him in his character. You should not withdraw yourself from others, but so act that you are not withdrawn from God, who has drawn you to Himself. What He has given you hold fast, so that no one deprives you of it. Do not let what He has planted in you be rooted up by the words of others. Let the fruit of His light ripen, and do not allow it to be eaten up by the worms of the world's culture.

2. Consider the two in connection: *proving* what is God's will, and *reproving* your neighbor. The former comes first, the latter is second. The former requires care in intercourse with God through His word, personal growth in His grace and knowledge, intimacy with Him, walk-

ing in His light, as His child. The latter, on the other hand, that you become for your neighbor a conscience outside of and beside him, as your own conscience has borne witness to yourself, or that like Sarah you speak silently in your conduct (1 Pet. iii. 1); very little depends on words, at least on many of them, only on apt ones, without scolding; be free and frank, true in love and lovely in truth (iv. 15). He who is not yet your brother, may and ought to become so; but you should no longer be to him what you were before Christ won you: a companion in his evil works and words.

3. In the concluding verse the grace of God is rendered strongly prominent, but in such a way as to indicate that it is in vain, if man's own act is not also present and he does not lift himself up by applying the power brought nigh and proffered him, his own strength increasing with the use of the power from on high which he appropriates. If he when awakened does not open his eyes and wake up, if when called he does not get up from his couch, he does not reach Christ's light or the walk in the day; this however takes place only in consequence of the initiative of Divine and imparted power.*

4. Finally it may be said, that as Paul immediately afterwards speaks of psalms and hymns and spiritual songs (ver. 19), so he here places on an equality with canonical Scripture the Christian hymn which grows out of God's word. Hence the importance of church hymnology. By this too we must test every hymn and hymn-book, that nothing apocryphal or heretical throws what is Scriptural into the back-ground, but that the truly Christian element of the hymn animates, furthers and subserves the Scriptures in the congregation, in the public service and in the household. [While compelled to object to the premise here laid down for the reason stated in the additional *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 14, we may well approve of the influence, which is valid on other grounds than the supposed citation of a Christian hymn. See further *Doctr. Notes* on the next section.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Comp. the *Doctr. Notes*.

You should not fly from men, yet you should not become their admiring slave, nor esteem yourself less than God has esteemed you, nor forsake His truth to accept human errors. Society has her assemblies generally in the evening; how much is there spoken in the artificial life of crowded halls resounding with human voices, with spirit and wit (but generally without this), confidently and with the approval of the mass. But as you go home in the quiet night, under the twinkling light of the stars or the shining of the moon, test what you have heard: Can you still highly estimate it? Have you not oftenest felt its emptiness with inward sadness? You have often thought, I would have got more by staying at home and chatting with my wife and children or with some friend! How then if you test it by God's word, by Christ's life? Prove all thereby!—Let no one say to you: You must believe without examining. But do not let any say of you, that you do so.—The world may ask: what is useful? what is admirable? what is lovely? what is customary? do you only ask: what is right and well-pleasing to the Lord?—Harless very properly says: Punishment is light! But Stier is quite as correct in saying; Light is punishment!—It is good to be convinced by *the light*, whether it breaks forth from the walk and word of a friend or a foe. To change one's way on account of the light is well, but when it comes from an opponent, then to do so is deserving of praise. It really amounts to nothing to accept a rebuke out of fear or gratitude, or any spirit of calculation: it is however a special gift of God, when one receives and is affected by the primitive element of the light, altogether irrespective of the man who bears the light, be he dear, influential, powerful or not. For only thus does the recipient become himself light.—Cherish a spirit of independence not merely *against others* for the truth, but also for others against falsehood; it is the latter that especially needs nurture.—Christ will enlighten thee here, but glorify thee hereafter, if indeed you are really an *enlightened Christian* and not merely a man *shone upon!*

Starke:—It is an old trick of Satan's to patch up the worst vices with the form of virtue and give them a free pass in the world under a false name. Craftiness is termed prudence, extravagance generosity, vindictiveness high-spiritedness, arrogance neatness, lechery politeness, avarice economy, etc.—True Christians are not credulous, silly and unreasonable people, but lights in the Lord, on the contrary the godless are such, 1 Thess. v. 5.—Where goodness, righteousness and truth cannot be met with, the Spirit of God certainly does not dwell.—Love and goodness must not go so far as to make justice and truth suffer: when these virtues, united together, kiss each other, all goes right. Christian reproof is one of the most excellent obligations of love; from its omission the lack of love and fidelity may certainly be perceived.—As much wickedness is done by the godless in secret, never coming to light; so on the other hand much good is done by the pious, that might be mentioned with praise, yet is concealed out of humility. For them it suffices that God and their own hearts know of it.

Rieger:—One of the greatest vexations, and at the same time a correct judgment, respecting the world is, that she has so many people who talk to please her and adorn her filthiness. But all these vain words will not cover her from the wrath of God. *Goodness* is the imitator of God in His love, by means of which we avoid anger, hatred, tumult, blasphemy, avarice. *Righteousness* prevents stealing, the unmerciful shutting of the hand against the needy, and avarice which like a weight of lead sinks one into darkness. *Truth* shuns lies, shameful words and buffooneries, foul talk, vain and seductive discourse.

* [Eadie compares the command of ver. 14 to "that given by our Lord to the man with the withered hand—'Stretch it forth.' The man might have objected and said, 'Could I obey thee in this, I would not have troubled thee. Why mock me with my infirmity, and bid me do the very thing I cannot?' But the man did not so perplex himself; and Christ, in exciting the desire to obey, imparted the power to obey." If every man would understand the philosophy of waking up before he gets up, what a world of sleepers we would have!—R.]

Thus Christian prudence is attained, which never seeks to go as far as it can without sin, but after the manner of well-behaved children, is ever concerned to meet God's approval.

HEUBNER:—*With vain words, i. e.*, deceiving talk, as though these vices belonged to things indifferent. This evil, perverted moral sense begets unbelief of morally strict Christianity and thus brings down God's wrath.—The Christian is an interested participant and yet separate and peculiar.—*On the Epistle for the third Sunday in Lent;* vers. 1–9. *The Divine walk of the Christian.* 1. Description. *a*) In general: Imitation of God, ver. 1; *b*) in particular: holy love (ver. 2) and pure, spotless life (vers. 3, 4). 2. Its necessity. *a*. For our own salvation; for without such walk we have no part in the kingdom of God and of Christ (ver. 5); *b*) for the salvation of others: for only such a walk can reprove the evil, corrupt principles of the world, and make out of unbelievers, children of wrath, believers, children of grace. What would the world be without Enochs? (ver. 6). 3. Means. *a*) Separate yourself from the company of the ungodly, leave the path of sinners, else you cannot walk godly (ver. 7). *b*) Accept the light of grace, that your darkness may be enlightened (ver. 8). *c*) Use the light however as you receive it, beginning with God's help to exercise your spiritual strength.—*The imitation of God, to which the Christian is obligated.* 1. In what it consists: *a*) In accepting the temper, which makes us like to Him as children to a Father (ver. 1); *b*) especially in love and holiness (vers. 2-4). 2. What makes this our duty: *a*) Our Christian calling, which should distinguish us from idolaters (ver. 5); *b*) our happiness, our freedom from the wrath of God (ver. 6). 3. What strengthens us thereto: *a*) Holding to the Church and accepting the light of the Word (vers. 7, 8); *b*) seeking the Spirit of God.—The spirit of Christian investigation is nothing else than Christian conscientiousness, with this rule: what pleases God? What pleases man is a matter of indifference.—The Christian is in duty bound to speak earnestly and decidedly against evil; he dare not be silent, where he ought to speak, still less approve with the men-pleasing spirit of the worldly wise.—The ground of this earnestness and reproof is the shamefulness of the world's vices.—What is made manifest through rebuke—is generally brought out of the darkness, in which shameless vice conceals itself, and placed in the light, so that it is thus evident to all as wicked. This is indeed the main matter.—All that is made manifest through reproof, so that the man is really made conscious of his sins,—is *thereby* overcome. This is the only path by which the Divine light rises within man in the place of darkness.—One must be roused, shaken, in order to be brought to consciousness. Out of the sleep of sin, in which he is not aware of the evil, he must be awakened, in order then to see what is in him.

PASSAVANT:—It is indeed an unhappy thing to be a companion of sinners, in follies and vices, in which one becomes a means of annoyance, corruption and distress to another, only to be companion in his shame and pain, hereafter in the despair of the Judgment Day.

STIER:—Words awaken lust, lust bears sin, this is the irresistible and dangerous course of *deceit*, against the *first* appearance of which in *words* we cannot too carefully guard ourselves.—Where there is unbelief, there is also the wrath of God!—Have nothing in common with them, for you are unwilling to have this wrath in common with them!—Not reproving is equivalent to having fellowship.—Darkness can become light only by means of a shining light, and the walk in the light is of itself able to judge and transform the darkness.—Let yourself be enlightened, that you may live, and become alive that the light may ever more fully shine on you!

GENZKEN (*Preparatory Discourse*): *Jesus* my *consolation* (ver. 2), my *love* (vers. 1, 2), my *Shield* (vers. 3–7) and great Reward (vers. 8, 9).

On the Epistle for the third Sunday in Lent (Eph. v. 1-9):—KAPFF:—What belongs to the walk in the light? 1. Fellowship with God in Christ; 2. Laying off all ungodly doings; 3. Living according to God's good pleasure (justification, repentance, sanctification).—RAUTENBERG: *That is real love, which goes even unto death for the brethren.* 1) It covers a multitude of sins; 2) is the fulfilment of the law; 3) is well-pleasing to God; 4) brings blessedness.—*How important are the sufferings of Christ for our sanctification!* The Holy Ghost works in us through them 1) powerful, sacred shame, 2) pure, self-sacrificing love.—*The sacrifice of Christ a sweet-smelling savor to God*—on account of the love 1) which brought it; 2) which makes room for it; 3) which is awakened by it.—THYM: The eternal love, 1) in its archetype, 2) its express image, 3) its copy.

[HODGE:—Ver. 6. It is not only among the heathen, but among the mass of men in all ages and nations, a common thing to extenuate the particular sins to which the Apostle here refers. It is urged that they have their origin in the very constitution of our nature; that they are not malignant; that they may co-exist with amiable tempers; and that they are not hurtful to others; that no one is the worse for them, if no one knows them, *etc.* Paul cautions his readers in every age of the Church not to be deceived by such vain words.—Ver. 10. Christ is here recognized as the Lord of the conscience, whose will is to us the ultimate standard of right and wrong. It is thus that the sacred writers show that Christ was their God—not merely the God of their theology, but of their religion.—Ver. 13. According to the Apostle, the relation between truth and holiness is analogous to that between light and vision. Light cannot create the eye, or give to a blind eye the power of vision; but it is essential to its exercise. Wherever it penetrates it dissipates darkness, and brings every thing to view, and causes it to produce its appropriate effect. So truth cannot regenerate, or impart the principle of spiritual life; but it is essential to all holy exercises; and wherever the truth penetrates, it dissipates the clouds of error, and brings every thing to view, so that when spiritually discerned it produces its proper effect on the soul.—Ver. 14. The light which Christ sheds around Him has power to awake the sleeping dead.—R.]

d. Exhortation to a pure walk, with careful consideration of the Christian position.

(CHAP. V. 15–21.)

15 See then that [how] ye walk circumspectly [strictly], not as fools [unwise men],
16 but as wise, Redeeming the time [Buying up the opportunity], because the days
17 are evil. Wherefore be ye not unwise [on this account do not become senseless],
18 but understanding[1] what the will of the Lord *is*. And be not drunk [made drunk]
with wine, wherein is excess [or dissoluteness]; but be filled with [in] the Spirit;
19 Speaking to yourselves [one another] in[2] psalms and hymns and spiritual songs,
20 singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord; Giving thanks always for
all things unto [to] God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ;
21 Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God [Christ].[3]

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 17.—[The reading of the *Rec.* (συνιέντες) is supported by D.[3] K. L., nearly all cursives, many fathers and good versions (Tischendorf, Ellicott and most); συνίοντες is found in D.[1] F. G., some versions (Harless, Meyer, Alford, earliest editions); the imperative: συνιετε has good support (א. A. B., 6 cursives, Chrysostom, Jerome), accepted by Lachmann and Alford (ed. 4). The last appears to be a correction, the participle being *lectio difficilior*, so that of the two participial readings the first is to be preferred on external grounds.—R.]

[2] Ver. 19.—[Lachmann and Alford insert ἐν in brackets before ψαλμοῖς, but as it is found only in B., 5 cursives, some versions, and could so readily enter into an explanatory gloss, it is generally rejected.—Both editors bracket πνευματικαῖς on much the same authority, doubting it as a probable interpolation from Col. iii. 16; but it might readily be omitted in a few cases from *homœteleuton* (Meyer).—Ταῖς καρδίαις, instead of τῇ καρδίᾳ (*Rec.* א.[1] B. K. L.) is found in א.[3] A. D. F., but is rejected by Tischendorf, Ellicott, Alford and most, as an emendation derived from Col. iii. 16.—R.]

[3] Ver. 21.—[The reading of the *Rec.* (θεοῦ) has no uncial support; while Χριστοῦ is found in nearly all MSS., and accepted by all recent editors.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The exhortation; vers. 15, 16. Ver. 15. **See then** [or **take heed**].—Βλέπετε with ἵνα (1 Cor. xvi. 10; 2 John 8), with the accusative (Phil. iii. 2; Col. iv. 17), here as in 1 Cor. iii. 10 with πῶς. *Sollicitudo etiam* MODUM *spectat* (BENGEL). They are enjoined to take heed, and because (οὖν) as the comprehensive quotation (ver. 14) says, they are awake, have arisen, been enlightened by Christ, to a walk such as has been spoken of (ver. 1: "beloved children," ver. 3: "as becometh saints," ver. 8: "as children of the light"). CALVIN is therefore too limited: *Si aliorum discutere tenebras fideles debent fulgure suo, quanto minus cæcutire debent in proprio vitæ instituto*; MEYER limits it also to vers. 10, 11.*

How ye walk strictly [πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε].—According to the context πῶς is to be confined precisely to the ἀκριβῶς *exacte ad voluntatem divinam* (LUTHER's rendering: *vorsichtlich* [so E. V.: circumspectly] is not sufficient); marking with the indicative that it is not first to be considered how this shall be taken hold of, but that it already exists in its best feature, the walk being an actual fact (WINER, p. 282). [ALFORD: "Take heed not only that your walk be exact, strict, but also of *what sort* that strictness is—not only that you have a rule and *keep to it*, but that that rule be the best one." The indicative is not used for the subjunctive or the future; comp. ELLICOTT *in loco* and *Fritzschiorum Opuscula*, pp. 208 f, note.—R.]

Not as unwise men, but as wise [μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοί].—"As," marking as in i. 8 the actual condition, and not comparative (*Vulgate: quasi*, is apt), designates the subject referred to in "take heed," "walk," as "wise." Hence "not as unwise" (BENGEL: *qui præter propter viam ambulant*), which is placed first for emphasis, denotes a subjective notion, which is inadmissible and unexpected as regards Christians. WINER, pp. 442, 567. Paul means Christians, in their walk, as indeed σοφός points to practice, walk, in works and evidences corresponding to the aim (i. 8; Jas. iii. 13), and not philosophers (GROTIUS), whom he ironically terms ἀσόφους.

Ver. 16. **Buying up the opportunity**, ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρόν.—This describes the "wise" in their walk. The phrase (Col. iv. 5) recalls Dan. ii. 8 (LXX.: οἶδα ἐγὼ ὅτι καιρὸν ὑμεῖς ἐξαγοράζετε). Nebuchadnezzar says to the Chaldeans, his servants, plainly, that they only want to gain time. Here however *sapienta et ἀκρίβεια præcipitur, non ignavia* (BENGEL). In distinction from the passage in Daniel, the article and the middle form are to be noticed. The right point of time, the appropriate time is the object of the ἐξαγοράζειν, the middle denotes that it is to be done *for themselves*, while the preposition ἐξ designates the complete entire character of the verb. Christians then should not allow τὸν καιρόν, to escape them, should seize the opportunity (χαιρός), though it costs them something in self-denial, after they have properly

* [EADIE follows CALVIN, HODGE follows MEYER, as respects οὖν, while ALFORD and ELLICOTT take the particle as resumptive from the περιπατεῖτε in ver. 8, and what followed it there. This is preferable unless the extended view of Braune be accepted.—R.]

looked at it, like a skilful merchant, and then redeeming it out of the possession of sin, of slothfulness and pleasure, of the flesh and of darkness, should make it their own and use it for Christian walk. The time is then not to be taken as it is, nor is LUTHER correct: "adapt yourselves to the time." Nor is it, to wait prudently and to temporize (BENGEL), or merely, to use for the ἐλέγχειν (FLATT, HARLESS).

[In regard to this phrase, we may accept as established: 1. That καιρόν means opportunity, not time, hence that the E. V. conveys a wrong impression. 2. That all special references to those *from whom* the purchase is made (bad men, BENGEL; the devil, CALVIN), or to the *price* paid (all things, CHRYSOSTOM and others), are irrelevant and unwarranted. The participle is one of manner, the ἐξ is referred by ELLICOTT and ALFORD to the collecting *out of*, the buying up, "calling your times of good out of a land where there are few such flowers." The exact sense then is: improve the opportunities which occur, looking out for them as a merchant, because the days are evil, and opportunities are rare; not as is often supposed: Be diligent in the use of time, because the days are few. The reference to Gen. xlvii. 9 will not justify this twisting of the next clause.—R.]

Because the days are evil, ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραί εἰσιν.—See Gen. xlvii. 9; 2 Tim. iii. 1. The days, the present period of life, the αἰὼν οὗτος, in which sin has her glory (OLSHAUSEN), are therefore "evil" on account of sin, creating hindrances and temptations, leading even to apostasy; hence not simply full of difficulties, unfavorable circumstances (RUECKERT).

Ver. 17. *The first point of view as respects the wise: the will of God.* **On this account**, διὰ τοῦτο, refers to vers. 15, 16, not merely as [OECUMENIUS, RUECKERT, DE WETTE, OLSHAUSEN] BLEEK and others think, to the reason ("the days are evil") appended to the designation of the "wise."

Become not senseless but understanding, μὴ γίνεσθη ἄφρονες, ἀλλὰ συνιέντες.—This can be said to those who are wise. For ἄφρον is *qui mente non recte utitur* (TITTMANN, *Syn.* I. p. 143), and is joined with νήπιος in Rom. ii. 20. They should not *become* this; they *are* not yet so, since they are "wise." [This is to be maintained against ALFORD, who as usual objects to rendering γίνεσθε, *become*.—R.] The antithesis ("but") is συνιέντες, "understanding" they should become discerning, and that is more than γινώσκοντες. A definite object is treated of, which in every case must be clear to the "wise," but which can however easily remain not understood:

What the will of the Lord is, τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου, *i. e.*, of Christ.—*Non solum universo, sed certo loco, tempore, etc.* (BENGEL).* This will reaching to what is least and most peculiar, is the object of the insight of the wise; the further he advances, the less is any thing to him *merely permissible;* everything becomes for him a precept and will from above. Acts xxi. 15.

Ver. 18. *The second point of view: Their own person, its inspiration.* **And be not made drunk with wine**, καὶ μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ.—"And" adds a second point to the first; it is not then=in particular (MEYER), as though it introduced a single vice, for which there is no occasion given by the context, since no general pleasure has been spoken of, the species of which could be named.—[The view of MEYER is accepted by most recent English and American commentators. The objection of Braune is not valid, it would seem; for the thought of pleasure does not enter in this clause either. The general notion is "not senseless, but understanding," and the special and emphatic subordinate thought is "not being drunk," a connection which is obvious enough. The state of drunkenness is viewed not as a sensual pleasure, but as a "senseless" condition. Comp. HODGE.—R.] The precept, after the reference to the will of God and from its position in antithesis to what follows, contains in the special a reference to the general as is allowed and required by the Scriptural view. Luke i. 15; xxi. 34; 1 Thess. v. 6-8; 2 Tim. iv. 5; 1 Pet. i. 13; iv. 7; v. 8. So "the wine of the wrath" (Rev. xiv. 8, 10; xviii. 3: xix. 15). The next clause points the same way.*

Wherein is excess, ἐν ᾧ ἐστιν ἀσωτία.—Ἐν ᾧ refers to the μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ;† in this there inheres as on a ground the fact (ἐστίν), which at the same time breaks out as a consequence. Ἀσωτία, the character of an ἄσωτος (ἄσωτος from σόω, σώζω), "past redemption" (Tit. i. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 4), in which one's own character is corrupted (φθείρεσθαι, iv. 22). TITTMANN, *Syn.* I. p. 152 f. [Comp. TRENCH, § XVI. The N. T. sense: *dissoluteness, profligacy*, seems to have arisen from the more common meaning of ἄσωτος: one who does not know how to save, *i. e.*, a spendthrift.—R.] Hence Luther is incorrect in rendering it merely: *unordentlich Wesen.* JEROME incorrectly limits it to lascivious excesses; KOPPE, DE WETTE and others to excess at the *Agapæ*, which are not suggested as in 1 Cor. xi. 21; MEYER and [most] others to the vice of drunkenness.

But be filled in the Spirit [ἀλλὰ πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι].—The antithesis is strongly marked (ἀλλά) and is to be found in πληροῦσθε, which stands first, as did μεθύσκεσθε, not in οἴνῳ and πνεύματι. [HODGE (with others) overlooks this in remarking: "To the Christian, therefore, the source of strength and joy is not wine, but the blessed Spirit of God."—R.] The imperative: Be filled! is not to be taken merely as καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ (2 Cor. v. 20), because it can be refused (Acts vii. 51) as well

* [The E. V. with its order: "what the will of the Lord is," suggests this definite knowledge in special circumstances, hence to alter it, as some propose, to: "what is the will of the Lord," would be not only unnecessary, but unfortunate.—R.]

* [It is to be feared that the rising from the special to the general renders too indefinite the very important precept of the Apostle. We may well hold fast to the plain literal meaning: "do not be made drunk with wine," this is an injunction deserving all the prominence it receives, even if no general sense be appended.—R.]

† [In which vice, in the becoming drunk (MEYER, ALFORD and most), not in the wine, the use of which is not forbidden (comp. 1 Tim. v. 23; Col. ii. 16, 20-23), although our passage proves that it was intoxicating.—R.]

as requested (Luke xi. 13), but because Christians in the strength of God have to be faithful and to show zeal, in order to increase and become complete; much then depends on themselves. This is an entirely different becoming full from being "drunk with wine." The qualification: ἐν πνεύματι, and not πνεύματι, is not an antithesis to οἴνῳ, but designates in and upon what the becoming full takes place, not in flesh and blood, but in the spirit of man, his better part. It is not instrumental, which cannot be established by i. 24; Phil. iv. 19, as MEYER supposes, nor does it refer to the Holy Spirit (most expositors down to BLEEK) or to our spirit and God's Spirit. That we should be filled with the Holy Ghost is indicated by the context, but not by ἐν πνεύματι. [The instrumental sense of ἐν, if accepted, must not exclude the more usual meaning: "with and in the Spirit" (EADIE, ELLICOTT). Here also, as in iv. 23, the exact sense of πνεύματι, in view of the preposition chosen, is neither the human spirit (Braune), nor the Personal Holy Spirit, but the human spirit as acted upon by the Holy Spirit (ALFORD and others). Comp. *Romans*, p. 235.—R.] FLACIUS: *præclara ebrietas, quæ sobrietatem mentis operatur!* Comp. Ps. xxxvi. 8-10; Acts ii. 15-18.

Closer definition of becoming full in spirit [or *the Spirit*]; vers. 19-21. *a. Social Song;* ver. 19 *a. b. Singing in private;* ver. 19 *b. c. Continual thankfulness;* ver. 20. *d. Proper conduct in one's position;* ver. 21.

Ver. 19 *a.* **Speaking to one another,** λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς.—The participle denotes the most immediate expression of this being filled in spirit by the Holy Spirit, and this result as an exercise re-acts as a means for furthering the fulness. *Spiritus facit fideles* DISERTOS (BENGEL). Ἑαυτοῖς, as in iv. 32; Col. iii. 16, is=ἀλλήλοις. In intercourse, in social circles, they return, in every case, to this point of speaking as is here described. [The reference to both social intercourse and public assemblies is now usually accepted. The reciprocal action on their hearts rather than the antiphonal method with their lips, is implied in the reflexive pronoun.—R.] It is not then=*meditantes vobiscum* (MORUS). The double sense: from inward impulse, with one another (STIER), is inadmissible, as well as the limitation to public assemblies for worship (OLSHAUSEN).

In psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς.—LUTHER is incorrect: by Psalms. Since ψαλμός is something historical (Luke xx. 42; xxiv. 44; Acts i. 20; xiii. 33), the word should here retain the meaning of Old Testament Psalms, which were well-known and had been accepted in the public service (*Apost. Constitutions*, II. 57, 5: τοὺς τοῦ Δαβὶδ ψαλλέτω ὕμνους); ὕμνος is a song of praise, according to the context (ver. 19: "to the Lord") and to history (PLINY in GIESELER, *Kirchengeschichte*, I. 1, p. 136: *Carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem*), to Christ, hence more strictly *Christian* hymns, songs of Jesus; ᾠδαὶ πνευματικαί are spiritual songs in general, productions of the Holy Ghost in the department of poetry as regards form, out of the Christian life as regards substance, distinguished from hymns as the spiritual song is distinguished from a song for the church and congregation, by being more general as regards matter and intended more for individual needs and private use. STIER hits it very nearly with his threefold distinction: Scriptural, congregational, private. It is improper to take the first as applicable to Jewish Christians, the second to Gentile Christians, and the third as referring to an expression understood by every one alike (HARLESS) or the last as the *genus*, the first as a hymn with musical accompaniment, the other as a song of praise, improvised, when it is true that out of the head as well as out of the heart only that which is known can be used, or that the heaping of terms is due to the lively and urgent discourse (MEYER and others), since he is not speaking of the day of Pentecost or of the gift of tongues (Acts ii. 4; x. 46; xix. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26) but of the orderly and regular course of things in the church; nor should all distinctions be rejected (RUECKERT).* "Spiritual" belongs to the undefined "songs," not to "psalms and hymns" (STIER), which are confessedly productions of the Holy Ghost; the word means precisely this however, and not merely that Christian thoughts and feelings find expression therein (BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS). Evidently the Apostle marks that Christians should interweave such into their conversation, often passing in joyous mood into united song, not however that such only should be recited, uninterruptedly said or sung.

Ver. 19 *b. Singing in private.* **Singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord.**—Joined as a co-ordinate clause without a connecting particle. The participle ᾄδοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες designate what is related, singing, the former in melody, the latter in recitative; the added phrase (ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν) however marks something different, that is done alone and inwardly. [So HARLESS, MEYER, OLSHAUSEN, ALFORD, ELLICOTT and others. HODGE favors what was once the common view: that the clause is subordinate, defining the mode or moral quality of the preceding one. But HARLESS has shown that such a view is incompatible with the presence of ὑμῶν, and few grammatical commentators have since differed from him.—R.] Here the social song re-echoes, here also is its ground and source. This is even stronger: not merely when excited in the company of others, to become joyously full of the Spirit, but to be that when alone also in disposition and desire "to the Lord" (τῷ κυρίῳ). Acts ii. 47; Jas. v. 13.

Ver. 20. *Continual thankfulness.* **Giving thanks always for all things,** εὐχαρισ-

* [While rigorous distinctions are not to be insisted upon, we may accept in the main the view of Braune. ELLICOTT: "Much curious information will be found in the article, '*Hymni a Christianis decantandi*,' in Deyling, *Obs.* No. 44, Vol. III., p. 430 sq.: for authorities, see Fabricius, *Bibliogr. Antiq.* XI. 13, and for specimens of the ancient ὕμνοι, *ibid.*, *Bibl. Græca*, Book V. I. 24." In the fourth volume of TISCHENDORF'S *Monumenta Sac. Ined.*, some hymns are found at the close of the Psalter, but the MSS. is incomplete, leaving us with a hymn incomplete.—In the face of such testimony there can be no question that the early church was not confined to the Old Testament Psalms.—R.]

τοῦντες πάντοτε ὑπὲρ πάντων.—Thus by the side of the joy is described that circumspect sobriety and thoughtfulness, which at all times and in all things sees and feels God's gracious hand, not merely singing, in public and private, in order to ask, but giving thanks uninterruptedly through the whole life. This is no popular, hyperbolical expression (MEYER); it is an established injunction of the Apostle (vi. 18; Col. iii. 17; iv. 2; 1 Thess. v. 19; Rom. xii. 12). Sufferings are included also (CHRYSOSTOM and others). [HODGE follows MEYER, in needlessly limiting πάντα to blessedness.—R.] It is indeed so difficult, that it is possible only for him who has God in Christ. Hence:

To God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ [ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί].—"In the name" designates the manifested, known and acknowledged Person ("of our Lord Jesus Christ"), in whom, that is: in fellowship with whom the situation in question is experienced: giving thanks (Col. iii. 17), asking (John xiv. 13), commanding (2 Thess. iii. 6), being baptized (Acts x. 48), reproached (1 Pet. iv. 14), saved (Acts iv. 12). We either bear or experience what He permits to be laid upon us or occur to us, or we act in His service, in longing after Him, or in the consciousness of His mediation (*per quem omnia nobis contingunt*, BENGEL); it is=ἐν Χριστῷ (iii. 21); similar to διὰ Χριστοῦ (Rom. vii. 25). Without Him we would have no living God, whom we thanked, least of all in Him the Father. The article (τῷ) points to the God known to us, and the phrase "God and the Father" indicates that the same God is a Father for us, our God and Father. It is incorrect to refer πατρί to Christ (HARLESS, MEYER). [On this august title, comp. i. 3; Gal. i. 4; it seems perfectly proper to accept a reference of a general character: *the* Father, our Father and the Father of our Lord, without limiting it to either or here emphasizing either.—R.]

Ver. 21. *Proper conduct in one's position.* **Submitting yourselves one to another.**—Ὑποτασσόμενοι, a co-ordinating participle [not to be taken as an imperative, CALVIN and others.—R.], refers to the position, also a gift and ordinance of God, in which one should be considerate and contented as regards superiors and inferiors (ἀλλήλοις), in piety, as well as in charity, in service in each direction, but: **in the fear of Christ,** ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ.—According to 2 Cor. v. 11 ("the fear [not "terror," E. V.] of the Lord") and 1 Cor. x. 22 ("Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? are we stronger than He?"), this means fear before Him, as the present Lord, the Head,* marking the tender awe of the conscientious, the humble and zealous imitation, not the fear before the Judge (HARLESS, MEYER and others).

[HODGE connects this verse with what follows, a view which is very convenient, but not grammatically admissible, though vers. 22 ff. do carry out the thought in detail. He says his view is generally accepted, but the view of Braune is held by KNAPP, TISCHENDORF, RUECKERT, HARLESS, MEYER, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, EADIE, in fact by every recent commentator, who gives due place to grammatical considerations, OLSHAUSEN excepted. The connection is difficult however. ELLICOTT finds here named a comprehensive moral duty in regard to *man* (after the three duties in regard to *God*) the exact connecting link being "thanking God for all things (for sorrows as well, submitting yourselves to Him, yea) submitting yourselves one to another." ALFORD thinks the thought is suggested by ver. 18: "that as we are otherwise to be filled, otherwise to sing and rejoice, so also we are otherwise to behave—not blustering nor letting our voices rise in selfish vaunting, as such men do—but subject to one another," *etc.* So EADIE.—R.]

* ["*Rara phrasis*, Bengel; of Him, whose members we all are, so that any displacement in the Body is a forgetfulness of the reverence due to Him" (ALFORD).—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Christian mode of life is precisely *wisdom*, which has first of all as a pre-supposition the *possession of the truth*, and is essentially the *appropriation* and *acquisition* of truth, or the capacity and readiness, clearly perceiving the truth in every case, position and event, to use it in life, by which use it is not squandered, but increased for the possessor. It is truth becoming or already made practical. It is not a knowing much, but a unity of the knowledge of the truth, a unity referred to the kingdom of God, and hence the doing of the truth; Christian morality is true wisdom, it is of a thoroughly ethical nature, although it never renounces its intellectual character. It is the common bond of truth, love, freedom and rectitude. It takes notice of all, world and nature, the heart itself and men about it, sorrow and joy, circumstances and events, rights and duties, the past and future and present, and above all, what concerns the soul, God's word and counsel, and the course of His kingdom. It learns experience in all and gains a certain tact, which grows in clearness and confidence, so that it readily knows, what it ought to do and why, while at the same time it is willing and able to do it. Accordingly correct life and correct doctrine meet together in wisdom. *Prudence* is a natural gift; a child, an unsanctified man, may be prudent. It is only formal, mainly without regard to a definite object; you *may* be prudent in temporal, even in shameful things, as well as in Divine, eternal things; in the latter you *ought* to be or become so. Prudence is circumspection, insight, intelligence, discrimination, appreciation and estimation; wisdom applies it to what concerns God and the soul, to the department of practical ethics.

2. A principal trait of wisdom and Christian morality is the *improvement of the time*, in which it considers and effects what is eternal. Every moment of time is of value to it to be used for the eternal; it perceives the transitoriness of time, but hastens the more to use it as an opportunity, to improve it for eternity. Like a merchant, it makes traffic in time to gain in eternity. Every year, every greater or smaller portion of time, is viewed and treated with reference to the God-appointed duties, so that time appears as measured out eternity. Wisdom fears to destroy

time, avoids mere pastime,* is unwilling merely to enjoy time, regarding it rather as a season, given of God's eternal grace, in which the power of body and soul bestowed by God, operates for the glory of His name and the soul's own salvation, so that from this no complaint or accusation arises.—Precisely the evil days, which continue as long as sin has power, it views as the set time and urgent occasion to wholesome improvement.

3. The two main points of view for wisdom are: *Understanding of the Divine Will* and *active circumspection of spirit*. The first is the everywhere valid and objectively given foundation of the Divine will, with which nothing that will be moral, Christian, wise, dare enter into opposition. All culture which lacks an intimate, lively regard for the will of God, is without wisdom also, hence foolish, despite all knowledge and clever character. The other however is sobriety. STIER:—"Not only every passion, every merely sensuous pleasure, every dissipation leaving the heart unguarded and lost in the creature, every waste of time called pastime, even the most dutiful, sober 'business,' if it entirely absorbs, has in it something intoxicating; before all however is it the fanaticism of opinion, of error, which the devil will present to us in the most various mixtures, often under the most enticing appearance, out of the great intoxicating cup of the spirit of the age, 'of the power of the air' (Rev. xvii.)." Or one might present a gradation from the common intoxication with wine or brandy, to the "most spirited" form of a "lay-breviary."

[The particular precept must not be overlooked in the general application. EADIE well remarks: "There is in the vice of intemperance that kind of dissoluteness which brooks no restraint, which defies all efforts to reform it, and which sinks lower and lower into hopeless and helpless ruin. There are few vices out of which there is less hope of recovery—its haunts are so numerous and its hold is so tremendous." Especially when the craving opens the door to covetousness on the part of the dealer and manufacturer, so that the victim is poisoned as well as besotted. No wonder that such a tremendous evil has driven most philanthropists and Christians to the advocacy of forcible measures for its prevention. Still the remedy is not *law*, but gospel. And "the freedom of the gospel" should never become a yoke of bondage. The two apparently contradictory principles to be reconciled in Christian practice, are (Col. ii. 16): "Let no man judge you in eating or in drinking," and (Rom. xiv. 21): "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine," *etc.*—R.]

4. As a *help to sobriety* the Apostle sets forth *first*, *the use in common of Christian hymns*, which should be used, though not exclusively, in public service. In this the *Psalms*, as Scriptural songs, with their parallelisms, probably gave rise to *antiphonal* singing between minister and congregation, the *songs of praise* ("hymns"), as ecclesiastical songs to *hypophonal* singing, in which the congregation repeated the last line of the stanza sung by the choir, and the *spiritual songs*, as Christians, to *symphonal* singing. The Holy Ghost, who presides in the Church, wrought beyond the word of Scripture, made art in word and tone serviceable to the Church, exercising His power in connection with public service and even in social intercourse. *So then* beside the use in common there must also be a *solitary* digging into such poetical treasures and a private application of them. *Further*, *every* gift should be *constantly* esteemed, recognized and used accordingly. *Finally* however in humility every *relation of subordination* ordained by God is to be regarded and maintained unimpaired; social institutions are God's institutions.

[In regard to singing in public worship and social intercourse, ver. 19 plainly shows that other than the Old Testament Psalms were and may still be sung. There is no warrant in the word of God for the exclusion of all hymns composed since the canon of Scripture was closed. Such a view owes its origin to causes quite as much political as religious, and perhaps always more national and local than logical or theological. Still it must be said that this extreme is fostered by a proper antagonism to what is now admitted into the public and especially the social services of Christians. It were better to sing nothing else than the Psalms than to encourage the introduction into congregations of hymn-books, born, not of spiritual feeling, but of pecuniary greed. Especially is it unfortunate that the children in our Sunday Schools are taught bad taste in music, bad morals and worse doctrine by what they sing. The full effect of this mistake has not yet appeared. Comp. *Colossians*, p. 72.—"Christ is the centre of sacred art as well as of theology and religion. From Him music has drawn its highest inspiration. The hymns of Jesus are the Holy of holies in the temple of sacred poetry. From this sanctuary every doubt is banished; here the passions of sense, pride and unholy ambition give way to the tears of penitence, the joys of faith, the emotions of love, the aspirations of hope, the anticipations of heaven; here the dissensions of rival churches and theological schools are hushed into silence; here the hymnists of ancient, mediæval and modern times, from every section of Christendom, unite with one voice in the common adoration of a common Saviour. He is the theme of all ages, tongues, and creeds, the Divine harmony of all human discords, the solution of all the dark problems of life" (SCHAFF, *Christ in Song*, preface). To banish Christian hymns is to exclude from this Holy of holies, but to substitute for them unworthy, unspiritual, and unchristian rhymes is to *profane* it.—R.]

5. *The principle*, *impulse* and *norm* of all Christian morality, of the new, Divine life, is *Jesus Christ*, the Fulfiller of the Law and Divine Will; for He is "the *manifestation of the willing Divinity and fulfilling humanity* (HARLESS, *Christliche Ethik*, p. 362). All other motives adulterate or counterfeit the new life.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The Christian has not like a philosopher first

* [What relaxation the body demands is certainly not forbidden by ver. 16. If any one thinks that he is better redeeming the opportunity by so overtasking his brain or his conscience either, as to die early or be laid upon a bed of sickness, or unfitted for duty by dyspepsia, melancholy or what not, he makes a great mistake. What God says so plainly in our frames is not to be overborne by seemingly pious principles; if it is, God punishes us.—R.]

to seek the truth; "as wise," he possesses it and must evidence it in his walk. With the philosopher all depends upon exactness and acuteness in the tide of his thoughts, with the Christian, however, upon his care in the course of his conduct; the former works out a system, the latter a fine character; the former will grow, while his forerunner decreases, the latter will decrease, but his forerunner must grow in him.—Christian wisdom as manifested in the acceptance and application of three proverbs: 1. Time is money! 2. Time gained, all gained! 3. Good fishing in troubled waters!—He who does not become wise in hard evil days, certainly remains a fool in good days.—It is just the evil days that you should not let pass by unimproved, for in the evil days of earthly life in this valley of tears we must gain for the good days in eternal life on God's throne.—The evil days are only the so-called bad weather so needed for the growth of the inner man and God's plants.—There are periodicals and books of all kinds, especially novels, which are like cups full of intoxicating wine, and instead of being bread, they should be burned like the books of magic in Ephesus (Acts xix. 19).—The house and household life should not be isolated from the Church and its services, especially its lovely, consolatory, precious hymns. —Thankfulness and humility are two principal emotions of a glad Christian heart: the former sees the *gifts*, which it has received from the Lord, the latter the *duties* He has appointed. Without serving love that Christian exaltation is not true, but a lie. The Christian must not ask; Who should minister to me, but: to whom should I minister?

STARKE: Foresight and wisdom belong to Christianity: not the cunning of this world, but the prudence of the righteous. It is like a bee, drawing honey from good and bad examples alike. —Redeem the time then, and give good heed to the blessed hours, when the Spirit of God knocks at thy heart. Many men are laden down with so much work in their avocation, that they often do not have the proper time for eating, still less for reading God's word, prayer, and other godly practices: it is especially necessary for these persons to forestall and even to steal time, that they may gain an occasional opportunity for spiritual exercises and collecting their heart before God; and besides this to accustom themselves to lift their heart to God in the midst of business, and to carry on the same in the fear of God.—The will of the Lord is our rule, to know and follow it is the greatest wisdom.—Wine is a good gift of God; but alas! all gifts of God are abused, and so is wine.—In one heart there may not dwell at the same time the fulness of the Spirit and the fulness of the world: God does not enter unless the creature retires thence.—Our Church has a rich treasure of spiritual songs ever increasing; it is a shame that they are so often sung without knowledge or thought.—Great benefits demand great thankfulness.—The fear of God is the bond, which should so unite all Christians together, that they submit to and serve one another.

RIEGER. The evil mixture of light and darkness with which so many are pleased, and in which they seek their wisdom, will, as folly, become their shame. In a wise walk every child of the light looks chiefly to himself and the keeping of his own way.—In the adapting one's self to the time, or redeeming the time, one looks to others also, how they are to be approached, or to be served, which is not the same in one case as in another.—Luxury in eating and drinking hinders true wisdom very much.

HEUBNER: One can permit himself to be robbed of much time. *Amici fures temporis.* Redeeming the time is opposite of whiling away the time. It is a frivolous thought, that of regarding time as an evil. There is a great difference between the worldly wise and the Christian mode of making time profitable. The former seeks to gain as great a pecuniary advantage as possible out of circumstances of time; the Christian regards the pressure and the evil of the time as a means to spiritual gain, as an exercise to faith, and hence places himself in a spiritual attitude to the time; he is for example, prepared for great sacrifices, for privations, sorrows and afflictions, which he has to bear, for difficult duties, disturbances and the like. To the worldly man that time is evil, when his pleasure is interrupted or hindered by sickness, scarcity, *etc.* The Christian holds that for the evil time, when virtue decreases and is made more difficult for himself, when the good have much to suffer, and the enticements to faithfulness and apostasy are great.—There is also a great inward song, when at work, on a journey or a walk, *etc.* Such singing imparts a quiet, glad, godly tone to the spirit. Learn good hymns by heart therefore.—*The Epistle for the 20th Sunday after Trinity;* vers. 15-21: *The Christian disposition—the best help in evil days.* 1. It gives wisdom to understand and to use aright the evil days (vers. 15-17). 2. It gives us cheerful courage, aroused not by wild intoxication, but by God's Spirit, fitting us for proper reflection (vers. 18-20). 3. It teaches the willingness to serve one another in the right way (ver. 21).—*The duty of the Christian, to adapt himself to the time.* 1. What it requires? *a*) Wisdom which bears unavoidable evil as of God's sending, not murmuring, nor resisting, nor walking uncircumspectly therein. *b*) Wholesome use of it for the soul's benefit. 2. Means: *a*) Knowledge of the Divine Will, of the purposes of Divine Providence and of our salvation. *b*) Religious inspiration and meditation. 3. The blessing: *a*) For us; all must serve for our profit, that we give God thanks: *b*) For others, that we serve and help them.

PASSAVANT: It is no easy matter to set the right bounds to our joys; one drop follows another, pleasure entices to sensuality, joyousness to wantonness, forgetfulness to intoxication.—We must give thanks for every gratification even the smallest, which we enjoy from our Heavenly Father through Christ; for every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places and possessions. Whoever understands this, knows how to give thanks to the great Giver for every temporal and earthly good also, even the least.

STIER: The walk of a Christian to his goal is a worthy, exact, correct walking; only thus does he find and follow his path. In continuously increasing exactness and strictness as respects our disposition and conduct, we grow out of folly

into complete wisdom.—To gain *the* time is something other than to gain *time.*—To seek and to use opportunities, to make a prudent choice of the point of time, to esteem time and be busy accordingly, to use prudently and circumspectly the time with its circumstances, this is the meaning of redeeming the time.—The special public service should not and must not be something altogether sundered from the private life of the Church.—The *ministry* must always reach the spirit, lay the foundation anew; but the congregation comes in with its praying, responding, singing, praising.—The thankful taking and *returning* of God's grace is itself true gracefulness. —The root of all apostasy and disobedience is ingratitude.

On the Epistle for the 20th Sunday after Trinity (Eph. v. 15-21): *Gesetz und Zeugniss*, 1862 [a German theological periodical]: *How does the wisdom of the Christian display itself in walk?* 1. In a *circumspect* walk (strait gate, narrow is the way; the days are evil). 2. In an industrious use of the means of grace (the Lutheran Church, the triumphing one, with large capital of the Holy Ghost). 3. *In humble conduct.* (As the most worthy proof of reason is in sobriety, and the greatest blessedness of a correct walk is shown in a life full of thanksgiving, so in various forms of submission the most delicate tact of this life appears. Thus are added the noblest limitations of life and the purest and most considerate forbearance in all relations.—LÖHE.)

BRANDT: *Earnest demands of the gospel in an evil time.* 1. It is a time of *ignorance* respecting *Divine* things, and it calls out to us in ver. 17. 2. It is a time of the *dominion of disorderly lusts* and propensities, and we are warned as in ver. 18. 3. It is a time of *ecclesiastical lukewarmness*, and enforces the precept of vers. 19, 20. 4. A time of restless excitement, saying to us as in ver. 21.

RAUTENBERG. *The prudence of the children of God in the evil time.* 1. They secure to themselves a *free hand*, to seek their safety—amid all the *power* of the evil time; 2. An *open ear* for God's will—amid all *self-will* of the evil time; 3. A *well-prepared heart* for the gift of the Holy Ghost—amid all the *carnal mind* of the evil time, a joyful spirit in the Lord—amid all the complaints of the evil time. STAUDT: The life of the *new man* 1) *in foresight*, 2) *insight*, 3) *penetration* (*Durchsicht*).

PRÖHLE: Rules of Christian practical wisdom. 1. Prudent foresight. 2. Earnest retrospect. 3. Pious insight. 4. Moderation in pleasure. 5. Practice in sacred song. 6. Constant thanks to God. 7. Due subordination.—Become full of the Spirit! 1. Full of the Spirit. 2. Full.

[EADIE: Ver. 15. Wisdom and not mere intelligence was to characterize them; that wisdom which preserves in rectitude, guides amidst temptations, and affords a lesson of consistency to surrounding spectators.—It is a strange infatuation to be obliged in pointing others to heaven, to point over one's shoulder.—Ver. 18. Drunkenness was indeed an epidemic in those times and lands. Plato boasts of the immense quantities of liquor which Socrates could swill uninjured; and the philosopher Xenocrates got a golden crown from Dionysius for swallowing a gallon at a draught.—It is a sensation of want—a desire to fly from himself, a craving after something which is felt to be out of reach, eager and restless thirst to enjoy, if at all possible, some happiness and enlargement of heart—that usually leads to intemperance. But the Spirit fills Christians, and gives them all the elements of cheerfulness and peace; genuine, elevation and mental freedom; superiority to all depressing influences; and refined and permanent enjoyment.—Ver. 19. Mere music is but an empty sound; for compass of voice, graceful execution, and thrilling notes are a vain offering in themselves.—Ver. 20. So many and so salutary are the lessons imparted by chastisement—so much mercy is mingled up in all their trials—so many proofs are experienced of God's staying "his rough wind in the day of His east wind," that the saints will not hang their harps on the willows, but engage in earnest and blessed minstrelsy.—Ver. 21. This Christian virtue is not cringing obsequiousness; and while it stands opposed to rude and dictatorial insolence, and to that selfish preference for our opinion and position which amounts to a claim of infallibility, it is not inconsistent with that honest independence of disposition and sentiment which every rational and responsible being must exercise. It lays the foundation also, as is seen in the following context for the discharge of relative duty,—it should be seen to develop itself in all the relations of domestic life.—SCHENKEL: The duty of subordination in the Christian Church: 1. It rests on the recognition of natural and historical distinctions, ordained by God Himself; 2. It has its pattern in the relation of believers to Christ, which is not one of servile fear, but of moral reverence.—R.]

4. Special Christian duties in domestic relations.

CHAP. V. 22—VI. 9.

Wives and husbands.

(CHAP. V. 22–33.)

22 Wives, submit yourselves[1] unto [to] your own husbands, as unto [to] the Lord.
23 For the husband is the head of the [Because a[2] husband is head of his] wife, even
as Christ is the head [as Christ also is head] of the church: [,] and he is [himself
24 *omitting* and he is][3] the Saviour of the body. Therefore, [Nevertheless][4] as the
church is subject unto [to] Christ, so *let* the wives [also] *be* to their own [*omit*
25 own][5] husbands in every thing. Husbands, love your[6] wives, even as Christ also
26 loved the church, and gave himself [up] for it: That he might sanctify [it,] and
cleanse [cleansing] it with the washing [laver] of [the] water by [in] the word,
27 That he might present it to himself a glorious church [That he might himself[7] present to himself the church glorious], not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing;
28 but that it should [might] be holy and without blemish. So [Thus] ought men
[husbands also][8] to love their [own] wives as their own bodies. He that [who]
29 loveth his [own] wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated [no one ever
hated] his own flesh; but nourisheth it, even as the Lord [Christ[9] also *doth*] the
30 church: For [Because] we are members of his body, [*being*][10] of his flesh, and of
31 his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his [*omit* his][11] father and mother,
32 and shall be joined unto his wife,[12] and they [the] two shall be one flesh. This is a
great mystery [This mystery is a great one]: but I speak concerning [I say it in
33 regard to][13] Christ and the church. Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular [Ye also severally, let each one] so love his [own] wife even [*omit* even] as
himself; and [let] the wife *see* that she reverence *her* husband.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 22.—[The *Rec.*, with K. L., many versions (Chrysostom, Scholz) inserts ὑποτάσσεσθε after ἀνδράσιν, while in D. E. F. G., Syriac it is placed after γυναῖκες. Lachmann accepts ὑποτασσέσθωσαν after ἀνδράσιν on the authority of ℵ. A., 10 cursives, Vulgate, other versions, some fathers. B. omits the verb altogether, and this reading is accepted by Tischendorf. Harless, Meyer, De Wette, Alford, Ellicott and recent editors. While one uncial manuscript would not be decisive for the omission, the variations in form and position suggest an interpolation. (comp. Col. iii. 18) and when to this is added the testimony of Jerome, who asserts that there was nothing in the Greek MSS. to correspond with his *subditæ sint* remarking that it was less necessary in Greek than in Latin, the evidence is conclusive. Still we must supply the verb in English.—R.]

[2] Ver. 23.—[The article is wanting in all uncial MSS., the *Rec.* inserts it on altogether insufficient authority. The meaning is not altered by the correct reading, yet the literal form adopted in the above emendation is on the whole preferable.—*His wife* is to be insisted upon, since the article is very definite here. We might render *His Church*, were there any other than *the one Church*.—R.]

[3] Ver. 23.—[The briefer reading αὐτός is accepted by nearly all recent editors on the authority of ℵ.[1] A. B. D.[1] F. Καὶ αὐτός ἐστι (*Rec.*) is found in ℵ.[3] D.[2 3] K. L., most cursives, good versions and many fathers; but seems to be an explanatory gloss. As regards punctuation the colon of the E. V. might be retained to indicate the independence of the clause. We can render: *He is Saviour of the body*, or *He Himself is the Saviour of the body*, or *Himself the Saviour of the body*, but the latter which is most literal requires a substitution of a comma for the colon of the E. V.—R.]

[4] Ver. 24.—['Αλλά must be thus rendered to give clearness to the sense. The *Rec.* reads ὥσπερ, but on insufficient authority; ὡς is well attested (ℵ. A. D.[1] F.) and generally received.—R.]

[5] Ver. 24.—[The *Rec.* inserts ἰδίοις on the authority of A. D.[3] K. L., many cursives, versions and fathers, but it is omitted in ℵ. B. D.[1] F., *etc.*, so that the weight of external authority and the suspicion of an interpolation from ver. 22 are decisive against it. Rejected by recent editors.—R.]

[6] Ver. 25.—[The *Rec.* inserts ἑαυτῶν, with D. K. L., most cursives; F. G. read ὑμῶν; while ℵ. A. B., cursives and fathers have simply τὰς γυναῖκας. The briefer reading is accepted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott. Braune, however, follows Meyer in defending ἑαυτῶν, on the ground that ἰδίας would have been a more natural interpolation, if an explanatory gloss were added. This is plausible, but scarcely decisive.—R.]

[7] Ver. 27.—[Instead of αὐτήν (*Rec.* D.[3] K.) recent editors accept the better supported and emphatic αὐτός (ℵ. A. B. D.[1] *etc.*).—The emphasis resting on ἔνδοξον is best presented by the order given above, though Ellicott gives: *in glorious beauty*.—R.]

[8] Ver. 28.—[There is a doubt as to the correct order as well in regard to the reading. Καί is omitted in the *Rec.*, ℵ. K. L., nearly all cursives, fathers and versions (Ellicott), but found in A. B. D. F., very good versions, and generally accepted since Lachmann.—The verb ὀφείλουσιν comes first in ℵ. B. K. L. and other authorities (Alford, Ellicott), but Lachmann, Meyer, Eadie, Braune and most put it after ἄνδρες, with A. D. F., good versions, fathers. The longer, noninverted reading: καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες ὀφείλουσιν is *perhaps* preferable.—The inversion of the E. V. need not be altered however

Husbands is more correct here, though in the older English *man* meant *husband* also, as in Greek and German, a philological fact not without interest in the exegesis of this paragraph.—ℵ.[1] has τέκνα instead of σωματα, but it is correct.—The E. V. omits *own* twice, apparently for the sake of elegance, but improperly since the emphasis is thus lost.—R.]

[9] Ver. 29.—[The *Rec.* (with D.[3] K. L., majority of cursives) reads: κύριος, but the authority for Χριστός is so decisive, that it is accepted by nearly all modern editors.—R.]

[10] Ver. 30.—[Lachmann, on the authority of ℵ.[1] A. B., good cursives, a few versions and fathers, omit ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς—ὀστέων αὐτοῦ. Alford brackets them. They are found in ℵ.[3] D. E. F. G. K. L., nearly all cursives, versions and fathers; accepted by Tischendorf (ed. 7), Harless, Meyer, Eadie, Ellicott, Wordsworth. The recurrence of αὐτοῦ would readily occasion the omission, while the citation is not exact enough to suggest an interpolation from the LXX.—We must insert *being*, to avoid the connection: members of his flesh, which the E. V. suggests.—R.]

[11] Ver. 32.—[The articles, τόν, τήν (so LXX. Gen. ii. 24), found in the *Rec.* ℵ. A. D.[3] K. L., most cursives, good versions, are rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer. Ellicott, Alford and most, on the authority of B. D.[1] F., good cursives, and distinct statements of Origen and Jerome.—So αὐτοῦ after πατέρα on the same authority (ℵ[1] in addition) and for the same reason.—R.]

[12] Ver. 32.—[Here instead of τῇ γυναικί (LXX., ℵ[1] A. D.[1] F) the best editors accept πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ on the authority of ℵ.[3] B. D.[3] K. L., nearly all cursives, Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret.—R.]

[13] Ver. 33.—[Lachmann and Alford bracket εἰς, but the external authority (B. K., a few cursives) against it is slight, and it might have been omitted because not understood.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

To Wives; vers. 22-24. *a. The exhortation*, ver. 22; *b. The basis of it*, vers. 23, 24.

Ver. 22. *The exhortation.* **Wives, submit yourselves to your own husbands,** αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν.—This section with its particular duties is so closely connected to the last sentence: "submitting yourselves one to another," with its general duties, that the form is thus abbreviated. Accordingly the verb to be supplied should be imperative, as in some of the various readings, as is required also by the arrangement of the section itself (vers. 25, 28, 33). Bengel *Inferiores priore loco ponuntur, deinde superiores* 25, vi. 1, 4, 5, 9; 1 Pet. iii. 1, *quia propositio est de subjectione: et inferiores debent officium facere, qualescunque sunt superiores. Multi etiam ex inferioribus fiunt superiores: et qui bene subest, bene præest.* The term ἴδιος is almost invariably joined with "husbands" in the New Testament (Tit. ii. 5, 17; 1 Pet. iii. 1, 5; 1 Cor. vii. 2: τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα—τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα: xiv. 35). We even find ἴδιος αὐτων προφήτης (Tit. i. 12) marking in addition to the "their," that no strange (antithesis: ἴδιος) one is to be thought of. From this it follows that ὁ ἴδιος ἀνήρ is not simply=husband (Harless), nor ἴδιος=ἑαυτοῦ, αὐτου (Winer, p. 145). It has elsewhere its definite meaning=*proprius*, as Winer admits in regard to many passages, and the Apostle had in this one precept of obedience for the wife a good and sufficient reason for defining the husband with ἴδιος; this justifies the sharpening by which the command appears a natural one.* At the same time it points to the fact, that the wife is found to the husband in another way than he to her. She has here her calling, the avocation of the husband extends further. It is also to be noticed with Bengel: *Mulieres obsequi debent suis maritis, etiamsi alibi meliora viderentur consilia.* See *Doctr. Notes.*

As to the Lord, ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ.—The singular requires according to the context a reference to Christ (vi. 1, 5, 6, 7), and "as" marks a reality; behind the husband stands the Lord Himself. Thus the obedience is characterized. The obedience is to be rendered not to the husband as man, but as "own husband" in and by whose person the Lord is honored who has established the relation, whom the husband himself must obey.* Hence it is not the husband as lord (Thom. Aquinas, Semler and others).

The basis of the exhortation; vers. 23, 24.

Ver. 23. **Because a husband is head of his wife** [ὅτι ἀνήρ ἐστι κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός].—The foundation of the exhortation is introduced by ὅτι, "because." Ἀνήρ, "husband," without the article, designates generally every husband,† who as such is "head" of the definite wife, chosen and won by him (τῆς γυναικός). The position of the husband is thus marked as of an organizing, managing, controlling and deciding character, which is further set forth by the comparison immediately following:

As Christ also is head of the Church—Ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστός places Him as parallel with the husband (ii. 3; iv. 17). On "head of the Church," see i. 22; iv. 15. The wife and the Church are thus placed as parallels.

Himself the Saviour of the body.—This distinguishes Christ from the husband. Αὐτος emphasizes Christ: He and none other. Σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος, Saviour of the body, the Church, is He and He alone. It is thus explanatory of "Christ," marking His peculiar dignity, and not in apposition to "head." This is not applicable to the husband as respects the wife; for him also Christ is the Redeemer. [Alford thus expands the Apostle's thought: "In Christ's case the Headship is united with, nay gained by, His having *saved* the body in the process of Redemption: so that I am not alleging Christ's Headship as one entirely identical with that other, for He has a claim to it and office in it peculiar to Himself." So most.—R.] It is incorrect to take this as referring to the man also, in order thereby to remind husbands that they should make their wives happy (Erasmus, Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 133, and others); that thought belongs to the other part

* ["The duty of submission is plainly based on that tenderness, specialty, or exclusiveness of relationship which ἰδίοις implies" (Eadie). So Alford, Ellicott, following Bengel and Meyer, against De Wette, Harless, Olshausen.—R.]

* [Ellicott: "Viewed in its simplest grammatical sense as the pronoun of the relative, the meaning would seem to be, 'yield that obedience to your husbands which you yield to Christ.' As, however, the immediate context and still more the general current of the passage (comp. ver. 32) represent marriage in its typical aspect, ὡς will seem far more naturally to refer to the *aspect* under which the obedience is to be regarded ('*quasi Christo ipsimet, cujus locum et personam viri representant*,' Corn. a Lap.), than to describe the nature of it (Eadie), or the manner (De Wette) in which it is to be tendered. Still less probable is a reference merely to the *similarity* between the duties of the wife to the husband and the Church to Christ, as this interpretation would clearly require ὡς ἡ ἐκκλ. τῷ Κυρ.: See Meyer."—R]

† [Or better "a husband," as an example of the class, ὁ ἀνήρ would be "every husband" in each case, every one of the class (see Winer, p. 113): but the article with γυναικός means "his" in this case.—R.]

of the exhortation (ver. 25 ff.) and would weaken the notion of σωτήρ very much. **Stier** is over-refined in discovering in *σωτήρ—σῶμα* an etymological allusion, as Phil. iii. 20, 21.

Ver. 24. **Nevertheless as the Church is subject to Christ,** ἀλλά ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Χριστῷ.—Ἀλλά, "nevertheless," in spite of the difference between Christ and the husband, the resemblance between the Church and the wife remains. Hence the particle is adversative: *habet quidem id peculiare Christus, quod est, est servator ecclesiæ, nihilominus sciant mulieres, sibi maritos præesse, Christi exemplo, utcunque pari gratia non polleant* (Calvin, Bengel and others).* It is accordingly neither syllogistic=*ὥστε, οὖν* (Beza [E. V.] and others), nor continuative=*δέ* (Winer, p. 420), nor resumptive=*inquam* (Harless).

So let the wives also be to their husbands [*οὕτως καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἀνδράσιν*].—The οὕτως καὶ strongly marks the analogy. The verb is to be supplied as in ver. 22. The emphasis rests on the final words: **in everything,** ἐν παντί (1 Cor. i. 5)=*κατὰ πάντα* (Col. iii. 20, 22). From such a command we are not to infer that the reference is to Christian wedlock (Harless); this must indeed also be thoroughly correct. Neither the one (1 Cor. vii. 12-17) nor the other is to be accepted. "In everything" is limited by the context to that which the husband as such commands and which the wife as such has to do, but in neither contrary to the Lord. [Hodge: "It teaches its extent, not its degree. It extends over all departments, but is limited in all,—first, by the nature of the relation; and secondly, by the higher authority of God."—R.]

To husbands; vers. 25-31. *a. The exhortation,* vers. 25-28; *b. The basis of it,* vers. 29-31.

Ver. 25. **Husbands, love your wives,** οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας ἑαυτῶν. [See *Textual Note* [6]].—Thus the husbands are exhorted, but a closer definition follows: **Even as Christ also loved the Church.**—Καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστός places the husbands in emphatic parallelism with Him, and the wives with the Church (τὴν ἐκκλησίαν). *Si omnia rhetorum argumenta in unum conjicias, non tam persuaseris conjugibus dilectionem mutuam quam hic Paulus* (Bugenhagen). [Comp. the apt quotation from Theophylact in Ellicott, and the beautiful remarks of Chrysostom, cited at length by Alford *in loco.*—R.] Ἠγάπησεν, "loved" (John xiii. 34; xv. 12; 1 John ii. 8; iii. 14) is more closely defined by proof of fact.

And gave himself up for it,† καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς (ver. 2).—Here also we should not supply in thought: *unto death* (Meyer), if by that is meant only the death on the cross; the reference is to the entire suffering including the last act as the extreme point. Thus the love required of the husband, a love self-devoting even unto death, gains a significant depth, while there still remains something important which is incomparable: Christ first created the Church through love, as His love made a reconciliation of the world with God, redemption from sin, and death, eternal life and salvation.

Vers. 26, 27. *The end* of the self-sacrificing love of Christ.

Ver. 26. **That he might sanctify it.**—Ἵνα defines the *end: αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ.* There is here indicated a continued action and dealing towards and upon the Church, the result of which is expressed in ver. 27 ("that it should be holy and without blemish"); it is the positive activity, effecting the ethical form and demeanor which is well-pleasing to God. It is not merely *segregare et sibi consecrare* (Calvin [Eadie, but not to the exclusion of the idea of sanctification as a result.—R.] and others). The modality is set forth in the participial clause: **Cleansing it.**—Καθαρίσας, as in i. 9, 13. This indicates the negative activity directed against the evil which is to be removed; both, the positive and the negative, advance together and undivided. Hence it is not: after he cleansed it (Olshausen, Meyer and others),* nor, as though it were complete in a moment: and has cleansed it (Luther). It continues: it is not a single member of the Church that is spoken of, but the totality of Christians. By what means then is the Church cleansed from sin?

With the laver of the water, τῷ λουτρῷ† τοῦ ὕδατος.—Unquestionably this means baptism; the readers must have thus understood it (Harless); *insigne testimonium de baptismo* (Bengel). The article (τῷ) denotes something well known; besides ὕδατος and the connection with *καθαρίσας.* Comp. Tit. iii. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 11; Heb. x. 23; Acts x. 47; xxii. 16. But the water does not give the cleansing which is spoken of, nor the bathing or washing. It is the baptism, not the bath in the water. Hence there is further added: **in the word,** ἐν ῥήματι, in order to designate Christian baptism as to its essence. The notion of baptism, as a means of cleansing beside the sanctifying (see *Doctr. Notes* 5, 6), as well as the position of this phrase require us to take both together, and the usage respecting the word *ῥῆμα* and the connection by means of ἐν (like vi. 2: *ἐντολὴ ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ*) admit of this. Paul uses *ῥῆμα* (ver. 17; Rom. x. 8, 17; 2 Cor. xii. 4; comp. Heb. i. 3; xi. 3; 1

*[This view is simple, grammatical and introduces neither a truism (Eadie), nor an unnecessary limitation (Winer). It is accepted by Alford, Ellicott, Hodge and others. Eadie supposes an ellipsis, which is very objectionable. Alford: "But what I do say is, that thus far the two Headships are to be regarded as identical, in the subjection of the body to the Head." *Nevertheless* is on the whole the best rendering of ἀλλα.—R.]

†[It would be more literal and perhaps better accordant with the comparison to substitute the feminine pronoun (*her, she*) for "it" in vers. 26, 27, but our language is very stiff in its rules for gender.—R.]

*[Grammatically the participle may indicate either an act antecedent to or synchronous with that of the leading verb, either *having cleansed* or *cleansing.* The former is the view accepted by Ellicott, Alford, Eadie and Hodge, mainly on doctrinal or logical grounds derived from the reference to baptism which immediately follows.—R.]

†[This word occurs only here and in Tit. iii. 5. It means not "washing," but "laver," (*lavacrum,* Vulgate); comp. Ellicott *in loco.* Dr Hodge is scarcely justified therefore in finding an argument in favor of a particular mode of baptism in our phrase, which does not mean: a *washing with* water, as he implies. The allusion to the bride's bath before marriage is accepted by Eadie, and most.—R.]

Pet. i. 25) in a similar manner. [In all cases it refers directly or indirectly towards proceeding ultimately or immediately *from God* (ELLICOTT).—R.] The conjunction of καθαρός, ὕδωρ, λόγος, John xiii. 10; xv. 3, is well known. "The washing of water" takes place "in word," consists essentially therein, hence the reference to God's Word in general, and in particular to the name of the triune God and His promise. [ALFORD is quite correct in referring it to "the preached *word of faith* (Rom. x. 8), of which confession is made in baptism, and which carries the real cleansing (John xv. 3; xvii. 17) and regenerating power (1 Pet. i. 23; iii. 21)—so Augustine *Tract.* 80 in Joan. 3, vol. iii. p. 1840, Migne; where these memorable words occur, '*Detrahe verbum, et quid est aqua nisi aqua? Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum, etiam ipsum tanquam visibile verbum.*'" So substantially EADIE, ELLICOTT, HODGE and others. Comp. *Doctr. Notes.*—R.]

Hence it is incorrect to take ἐν ῥήματι, ἵνα as a Hebraism=to the end thereby (KOPPE and others), or as *formula baptizandi* (GREEK FATHERS, SCHOLASTICS and others). Nor is it to be joined with καθαρίσας (BENGEL, HARLESS, HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 135, who takes it as the word Matt. viii. 3: καθαρίσθητι), which would then have two means by the side of each other, or with ἁγιάσῃ (JEROME, WINER, p. 130, MEYER and others), for in that case it would of necessity have been immediately subjoined. [The connection with the participle is defended by EADIE, ALFORD and ELLICOTT (who more exactly suggests: "rather with the whole expression"). The absence of the article is strongly opposed to Braune's view, while the participle might well have two added qualifications, one an instrumental dative and the other specifying with ἐν "the necessary *accompaniment*" (ELLICOTT). "Thus *the word*, preached and received, is the conditional element of purification,—the real water of spiritual baptism;—that wherein and whereby alone the efficiency of baptism is conveyed" (ALFORD).—R.]

Ver. 27. **That he might himself present to himself the Church glorious,** ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἔνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.—This second ἵνα depends on ἁγιάσῃ, the end and aim of which it introduces: "He might himself present," *etc.* He and none other (αὐτός), without the co-operation of others for Himself (ἑαυτῷ)* and not for others, the world or anything else, to His own good-pleasure presents the Church gloriously. The figure (παραστῆσαι) is taken, as in 2 Cor. xi. 2, from the adorning of a bride; hence the emphatically placed ἔνδοξον, which in 1 Cor. iv. 10 is the antithesis of ἄτιμος, is like Luke vii. 25 (ἐν ἱματισμῷ) to be applied to the glorious appearance, so that the Church thus appears "worthy of the calling" (iv. 1), or "of the Lord" (Col. i. 10), "of God" (1 Thess. ii. 12; 3 John 6), *respondeat ideæ suæ æternæ* (BENGEL). The result of the ἁγιάζειν is the δοξάζειν, both belong together: *sanctitas est gloria interior, gloria est sanctitas emicans* (BENGEL)*.

The second clause beginning with ἵνα is not to be placed as parallel to the first, nor is the figure of an offering to be substituted for that of adorning (HARLESS). But it is to be maintained, that this state of things for the Church is not attained in this life (RUDELBACH), while at the same time we may say with BENGEL: (*id valet suo modo jam de hac vita*). The vital process in the individual and in the whole is indeed that of a development from seed to harvest, is not complete at one stroke, has its stadia and phases. The consummation is really only at the conclusion (Second Advent). [So ALFORD, EADIE and most. HODGE has a full note on the question.—R.]

Not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, μὴ ἔχουσαν σπίλον ἢ ῥυτίδα ἤ τι τοιούτων.—Thus the Apostle describes more clearly ἔνδοξον.—Σπίλος† (2 Pet. ii. 13; comp. Jude 12), parallel to μῶμος, designates what clings to her from without, spot and stain, what is loathsome, the remains of the previous walk and conversation; ῥυτίς, wrinkle, refers to internal emotions, which fix themselves in the countenance, and disfigure the face as it grows old. Other antitheses, as those of GROTIUS (the former applying to *carere vitiis*, the latter to *vegetos semper esse*, to what is good) are not justified by the language. The final phrase negatives the least spot or wrinkle or even what is similar, hence in general what can disfigure. ["The terms are taken from physical beauty, health, and symmetry, to denote spiritual perfection" (EADIE).—R.]

But that it might be, ἀλλ' ἵνα ᾖ instead of ἀλλ' οὖσαν, in accordance with the liveliness of the Greek, who liked the transition from the participle into the finite verb. WINER, p. 537. This ἵνα is parallel to the second one at the beginning of this verse. [Hence "might" must be substituted for "should" (E. V.), to indicate the parallelism.—R.] The final end of the sanctifying is the *being* **holy and without blemish.**‡—To the "wrinkle" proceeding from within the "holy" corresponds, to the external "spot" ἄμωμος, "without blemish" (i. 4).

Ver. 28. **Thus,** οὕτως, points emphatically to what precedes, on which account HARLESS (with ESTIUS: *digressus nonnihil ad mysterium, nunc ad institutum redit*) incorrectly excludes the definite comparison for wedded life, as though it were inappropriate, when only prudence, moderation are commanded. It is not to be referred to the following ὡς (B-CRUSIUS). [So ALFORD. But ELLICOTT, EADIE and HODGE agree with

* [More literally and correctly "to Himself," He alone presents, He receives (ELLICOTT).—R.]

* [ELLICOTT: "*The Church glorious;* the tertiary predicate ἔνδοξον (Donaldson, *Gr.* § 489) being placed emphatically forward and receiving its further explanation from the participial clause which follows." The reading of the *Rec.*, giving αὐτὴν as the direct object of the verb, necessarily led to the obscuration of the force of the word, disturbing the grammatical structure by making τὴν ἐκκλησίαν the tertiary predicate.—R.]

† [The German editors and commentators (TISCHENDORF and MEYER, Braune also) accent this word: σπῖλος, but EADIE, ALFORD and ELLICOTT adopt: σπίλος. The iota is short apparently, hence the latter is correct. The word belongs to later Greek.—R.]

‡ ["Blameless" (ELLICOTT, ALFORD); but "without blemish" retains the etymological reference, thus according better with the figurative current of the verse.—R.]

Braune, in referring οὕτως to what precedes, *i. e.*, "thus, in like manner as Christ," while ὡς indicates not the measure, but a fact, "as they are," *etc.*—R.]

Ought husbands to love their own wives [καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες ὀφείλουσιν ἀγαπᾷν τὰς ἑαυτῶν γυναῖκας].—The comparison with Christ is now especially denoted by καί before οἱ ἄνδρες. Ὀφείλουσιν presupposes a command for this, the "new commandment" (see ver. 25), which corresponds with nature, as God has ordained it,* and, applying to fraternal fellowship, is then certainly valid for marital fellowship, as is indicated by the next phrase which introduces a motive: **as their own bodies**, ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα.—Here ὡς is evidently a designation of a reality, corresponding to the figure, that the man is the head of the wife (ver. 23; 1 Cor. xi. 3). [See Eadie for a lucid statement of the correct view respecting this particle.—R.] It is not comparative (Grotius), hence not=as themselves.

The result of the view that the husband is the head of the wife, while the wife is the body of the husband, as the Church is Christ's body is this thought: **He who loveth his own wife loveth himself**, ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα, ἑαυτὸν ἀγαπᾷ.—Comp. ver. 33. On this general proposition what follows rests.

The basis of the exhortation; vers. 29-31.

Ver. 29. **For no one ever hated his own flesh**, οὐδεὶς γάρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν.—The ground which follows is introduced by γάρ.† In the first place a general fact is negatively expressed. "No man ever" is not limited; not even *nisi scilicet a natura et a se ipso desciscat* (Bengel). For all "unsparingness of the body" (Col. ii. 22) rests on self-deception. If he actually injures himself, it cannot even then be said that he "hateth his own flesh." Paul did not choose σῶμα here, because he already had in mind the quotation (ver. 31), which refers to the institution of marriage in Paradise before the fall; there as here all that is sinful is excluded from the σάρξ, which is not of itself subject to sin. Μισεῖν is chosen, because the disposition is spoken of; it is to be understood like 1 John iii. 15. Grotius aptly recalls Curtius, vii.: *corporibus nostris, quæ utique non odimus;* Seneca, *ep.* 14: *fateor insitam esse corporis nostri caritatem; De Clem.* 1, 5: *Si quod adhuc collegitur, animus reipublicæ tu es, illa corpum tuum, vides, ut puto, quam necessaria clementia sit. Tibi enim parcis, quum videris alteri parcere.* Comp. Prov. xi. 15, 17.

But nourisheth and cherisheth it [ἀλλ' ἐκτρέφει καὶ θάλπει αὐτήν.]—Ἀλλά naturally takes out of οὐδείς the subject ἕκαστος, each one. The first verb, the strengthened τρέφειν, refers to the growing development brought about through nourishment (Meyer); it occurs only here and in vi. 4. The second verb (only here and 1 Thess. ii. 7) is stronger than θερμαίνειν (Jas. ii. 16) which is also more general, and denotes the warming upon and with one's self; hence it is used of brooding, Deut. xxii. 6 (LXX.); it is more than *fovet* (*Vulgate*). *pflegt* (Luther). The two expressions are distinguished by Bengel so far correctly that he remarks on the former *intus*, on the latter *ad extra*, but he is faulty in thinking of *victus* in connection with the former, *amictus* with the latter. The one refers to the strengthening food, renewing the life, the other to the protection and preservation of the life. Harless incorrectly denies any distinction, taking both as descriptive of maternal love.

Even as Christ also doth the Church [καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν].—What is of universal validity within the sphere of creation, is found also in the Redeemer as respects His Church (He nourishes and cherishes it). Stier applies it to the Lord's Supper, which is indeed not to be excluded, thinking that after the *nasci* in the baptism (ver. 26) the *pasci* is here spoken of. It is more natural to remember how Christ calls Himself the bread of life (John vi. 48, 51), which "nourishes," not in the Lord's Supper alone, even though it takes place there in its most full and intense form, and also that He compares Himself to a hen (Matt. xxiii. 37) that covereth with her wings, thus protecting and cherishing (θάλπει) at the same time. Grotius (*nutrit eam verbo et spiritu, vestit virtutibus*) is correct only in the first part of his comment. Evidently the spheres of Creation and Redemption do not fall outside each other; the former finds in the latter its restoration and consummation, the latter in the former its basis and point of connection. What is unnatural is unchristian.

Ver. 30 proves the action of Christ to His Church through her intimate union with Him:

Because we are members of his body [ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ].—"Because" connects with the foregoing thought: He nourisheth and cherisheth the Church. The Church is now the subject, which inheres in ἐσμέν. Every individual is so, as the plural indicates. The Church as a whole as also individually, the members of the Church are then "members of His body." Here τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ is evidently=ὁ Χριστός (1 Cor. vi. 15; xii. 27), on which account Bengel is correct in saying: *corpus hic dicitur non ecclesia, quæ continentur in subjecto "sumus," sed corpus ipsius Christi;* hence this is entirely like 1 Cor. x. 16 (Stier). The membership, which is designated by the emphatically placed μέλη, and which is conceived of as existing in the word ἐσμέν, is designed to mark Christendom and Christians as "integral parts of His body" (Meyer). A closer definition follows.

Being of his flesh and of his bones, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ.—First of all the repeated preposition must be noticed, marking as it does the origin

* [From this passage Dr. Hodge correctly infers the falsity of the Hopkinsian view that all love and all holiness is disinterested benevolence, proportioned to the capacity of its object. We do love ourselves, and our bodies, and it is not only natural, but according to Scripture so to do.—R.]

† [The whole tenor of the argument is thus stated by Ellicott: "Men ought to love their wives as Christ loves His Church, as being in fact (I might add) their own (ἑαυτῶν) bodies; yes, I say the man who loves his wife loves himself (ἑαυτόν); for if he hated her he would hate (according to the axiom in ver. 28) his own flesh, whereas on the contrary, unless he acts against nature, he nourishes it, even as (to urge the comparison again) Christ nourishes His Church."—R.]

and the appertaining to. The phrase denotes the personality and corporeality of Christ, in which the Church with her members originates. The connection with and origin from Christ, from the historical, incarnate Christ, from His personal body, is designated in such a way, that we as well as the whole Church are to be regarded as His production and possession; and this is expressed with the Scripture passage, or at least with a reminiscence of the passage, which refers to the creation of the woman out of the first Adam in Paradise (Gen. ii. 23 : LXX.: *τοῦτο νῦν ὀστοῦν ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων μου, καὶ σὰρξ ἐκ τῆς σαρκός μου*), because Christ is the second Adam (1 Cor. xv. 45, 47; comp. 1 Tim. ii. 13), and the Church, as well as each of its members, is a creation (1 Cor. v. 19). Comp. the parable of the Vine and the branches (John xv. 1 ff). Our life in Christ proceeds in its inmost nature from holiness, is really strengthened from Him, and affects the resurrection body.

Accordingly it is inappropriate to think only of the close union of Christ with us (Koppe), or the identity of our nature with His (Latin Fathers), or only of spiritual origin (Greek Fathers, Erasmus, Calovius, Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, II., 2, p. 137, Meyer and others), or only of the death of the cross (Grotius: *ex carne ejus et ossibus cruci adfixis, i. e., ex passione ejus prædicata et credita ortum habuit ecclesia;* Schenkel, who refers to ver. 24), or the Lord's Supper (Kahnis, Harless, Olshausen, Stier and others), or the glorified body (Gess: *Christi Person*, p. 274 ff.). Bengel, who is followed, up to a certain point, by Stier, since he also finds in the creation of the woman out of Adam a type of the creation of the Church out of Christ, must be regarded as fanciful despite the several apt remarks he makes: *Moses* OSSA *prius, Paulus* CARNEM *prius nominat; naturalem quippe structuram, de qua ille, ossa potissimum sustinent; ut in nova creatione caro Christi magis consideratur. Porro Moses plenius loquitur; Paulus omittit quæ ad propositum non æque pertinent. Non ossa et caro nostra, sed* NOS *spiritualiter* (Stier: *via spiritualiter in corporationem vergente*) *propagamur ex humanitate Christi, carnem et ossa habente.* Rueckert is altogether perverted in his notion that the Apostle himself had no definite idea in his mind; if he waives an explanation of the passage, so he must waive first of all his own explanation.

[In agreement with the view of Braune, in the main, the following statement is appended. The Apostle here asserts a *state* (*ἐσμεν*) of Christians, originating from Christ (*ἐκ*), analogous to the physical derivation of Eve from Adam and the consequent union subsequently between them. The direct reference to every nuptial union (Eadie) does not accord with the preposition or the immediate allusion. This is the *mystical* relation, implying as Hodge well contends, something more than that we derive our spiritual life from Christ, as Eve her spiritual life from Adam (Ellicott, Alford, following Meyer), since the peculiar language seems to involve more; and something else than that we are partakers of the substance of Christ's body, as Eve was formed out of the substance of Adam's body (Calvin, and with various modifications most strong sacramentalists), a view which tends to materialistic conceptions of the union, and, in attempting to explain one acknowledged mystery, creates confusion instead of clearness. This middle position accepts a connection with Him, "not simply and generally by a spiritual union, but in some close and derivative way, which the Apostle calls a mystery" (Eadie), leaving the matter there. As regards the *secondary* application to the Sacraments, which Ellicott and Wordsworth (with many German commentators) accept, it may be remarked, that these undoubtedly constitute signs and seals, and in a certain sense means of maintaining this union, but this passage, which speaks not of "body and blood," but of "flesh and bones," does not distinctly refer to these, so that nothing can be deduced from it in regard to the communication with Christ's glorified, or transmuted, body in the Lord's Supper. Comp. the full, clear and excellent discussion of Hodge, who opposes Calvin's views most strenuously. —R.]

Ver. 31. Paul in this verse proceeds with the passage which follows the saying of Adam respecting the woman brought to him (Gen. ii. 24, LXX.: *ἕνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν*):

For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and the two shall be one flesh.—The changes are inconsiderable: *ἀντί* instead of *ἕνεκεν*, *πατέρα* and *μητέρα*, according to the best authorities, without the articles and pronouns, *τῇ γυναικί* at least a various reading as Matt. xix. 5. Notwithstanding this, it is not a quotation, since there is nothing to indicate this. He merely continues in the words of Moses, which he uses with slight variations, while the Lord introduces them (Matt. xix. 5) with *εἶπεν*, and Paul himself in 1 Cor. vi. 16, the last clause with *φησίν*. Further, this passage is not a part of Adam's speech, since he could say nothing of forsaking father and mother, unless it be taken as a prediction (Stier) [Jerome: *primus vates Adam*]; in which case, however, he would still in the last clause have prophesied respecting himself. [Comp. *Genesis*, p. 209.—R.] Hence it is not strange that the Apostle passes over the intervening clause, in which Harless unnecessarily finds a difficulty.

Ἀντὶ τούτου is then, if we compare *ἀνθ' ὧν* (2 Thess. ii. 19; Luke i. 2; xii. 3; xix. 44), *for this*, that the woman is taken from the man, he will cling to her; *εἰς ἀμοιβήν* (Winer, p. 342). Paul unmistakably thus returns to the conjugal state, after he has finished the proof (ver. 30) for "as Christ also" (ver. 29). Hence it is not necessary with Bleek to supply after ver. 30: we are of His flesh and bones, the following middle term: as the woman is not of the flesh and bones of the man, to which ver. 31 refers. *Τούτου* is not to be referred to our origin from Christ, to whom the forsaking of father and mother does not apply, the forsaking of father not in the future at least (*καταλείψει*), and such a reference is foreign to the purpose, the clinging

to the wife, the Church, since either this did not at all exist when He was born a man, or He already clung to it in love, without the necessity of first forsaking the Father. Indeed, the future (καταλείψει) may be regarded here in this saying of *Moses*, analogously to the future [the *ethical* future] of the commandments (Rom. xiii. 9: οὐ μοιχεύσεις, κ. τ. λ.), as the precept corresponding to the relations as established in God's word.

Καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν refers to a gradual coming to pass of unity (hence εἰς with the accusative), and that, too, in the case of two different persons (οἱ δύο, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ, Gen. i. 27), who from within becomes one in all external circumstances, *non solum uti antea, respectu ortus, sed respectu novæ conjunctionis* (BENGEL). Hence it is not necessary to find here only a prophecy of the Second Advent of Christ, who now as Betrothed and afterwards as husband, clings to the Church (MEYER), nor in the Mosaic passage a prophetic type of Christ and His Church (STIER), nor to refer the last clause to the Lord's Supper (CALVIN, BEZA, HARLESS, OLSHAUSEN, KAHNIS).

[The main difficulty is in regard to the connection. MEYER (and many others from CHRYSOSTOM to ALFORD) refers "for this cause" to ver. 30, thus applying our verse to the relation of Christ and the Church. But the Apostle is recalling a passage at the basis of which lies the fact of Eve's being taken out of Adam, and the slight alteration he makes does not show an intent to apply it differently here. Besides the whole section treats of the relation of husband and wife, and this is, therefore, to be regarded as the leading reference unless the other is distinctly marked. This principle the Apostle himself assumes in ver. 32: "But *I* speak concerning Christ and the Church." At the same time we must accept a secondary *application* (ELLICOTT) to Christ and the Church, not simply because most commentators have done so, but because the whole tenor of the passage and the interpretation of ver. 32 seem to demand it. The view of HARLESS, OLSHAUSEN and HODGE, that the last clause alone refers to Christ and the Church, the early part being introduced merely for the sake of that clause, seems to be an exegetical make-shift. As the Apostle had left out a part of the original passage in Genesis, he might just as readily have omitted all that was irrelevant. Still less tenable is the special application, which OLSHAUSEN makes, comparing the Lord's Supper and conjugal cohabitation, showing that allegory may serve to foster the coarsest materialistic conceptions. MEYER's paraphrase is as follows: "*Wherefore*, because we are members of Christ, of his flesh and bones, *shall a man leave* (*i. e.*, Christ at the Second Advent) *his father and his mother* (*i. e.*, according to the mystical sense of Paul: He will leave His seat at the right hand of God) *and shall be joined to his wife* (to the Church), *and* (and then *the two*) (the husband and the wife, *i. e.*, the descended Christ and the Church) *shall be one flesh*." Such a view is to be expected from this commentator, whose grammatical exactness is exceeded only by his fondness for bringing in a reference to the Second Advent, but it fails to meet with general acceptance. JEREMY TAYLOR: "Christ descended from His Father's bosom and contracted His divinity with flesh and blood, and married our nature, and we became a Church;" but this confuses our nature with the Church, as well as, impliedly, the Bride and the offspring. ALFORD is safer in regarding "the saying as applied to that, past, present, and future, which constitutes Christ's union to His Bride the Church: His leaving the Father's bosom, which is *past*—His gradual preparation of the union, which is *present*, His full consummation of it, which is *future*." All these views may be held as partial elucidations of the matter in hand on the side of the application to Christ and the Church, which was doubtless in the Apostle's mind, but we still insist that so detailed a passage has a primary reference to a union, where a mere man leaves his earthly father *and mother*, and is joined to his wife.—With all these allegorical interpretations, one thought, which inheres in the passage, as referring to the human relation, has been too much overlooked, *viz.*, that it is the *man* who forsakes father and mother. It is remarkable how true this is, and how it comes out in works of fiction, in homely sayings like this: "My son is my son till he gets him a wife, but my daughter's my daughter all her life," in the feelings, since mothers and sisters are rarely jealous of the man, but so often of the woman, who marries into the family. Nor does social custom fail to recognize this. The basis of all is the principle set forth in vers. 28, 29.—R.]

Comprehensive double conclusion; vers. 32, 33.

Ver. 32. **This mystery is a great one,** τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν.—The position of the words must be noticed. WINER (p. 163) remarks that οὗτος usually comes before the noun, and ἐκεῖνος after, and that accords with the nature of the case. Deviations have their ground in the context. Paul lays the stress here on "mystery," the position after the noun weakens the demonstrative; it is not δεικτικῶς, does not refer to the last point alone. There is here a retrospect over the whole paragraph. BENGEL is correct: *mysterium appellatur non matrimonium humanum* (*ver.* 33), *sed ipsa conjunctio Christi et ecclesiæ.* "Mystery" (i. 9; iii. 3, 4, 9; vi. 19) is a fact, which either entirely or partially transcends the understanding, as the Divine will, a decree of God, the truth in its depth, *etc.* Here it is the union of the man and woman in wedlock, and of Christ and His congregation in the church, which the Apostle so presents that the latter is the pattern, and the former the copy. It is irrelevant to suppose a reference to a concealed sense in the words of Moses, so that εἰρημένον, γεγραμμένον, is to be supplied (GROTIUS, STIER, RUECKERT, MEYER and others). It is termed "great," because Paul himself *plus sensit, quam ii, ad quos scribebat, caperent;* comp. Rom. xi. 33.

[HODGE seems inclined to refer "this mystery" to the union of Christ and the Church, in accordance with his view of ver. 31. EADIE agrees exactly with Braune, while ALFORD refers it to "the mystery of the spiritual union of Christ with our humanity, typified by the close conjunction of the marriage state," alluded to in

ver. 31. ELLICOTT applies it to the close conjunction of the married state: He adds: "Ver. 29 states the exact similarity of the relationship; ver. 30 the ground of the relation in regard of Christ and the Church; ver. 31 the nature of the conjugal relation with a probable application also to Christ; ver. 32 the mystery of that conjugal relation in itself, and still more so in its typical application to Christ and His Church." EADIE: "Vers. 25-28 introduce the spiritual nuptial relation, ver. 29 affirms its reality, ver. 30 gives the deep spiritual ground or origin of it, while the quotation in ver. 31 shows the authorized source of the image, and ver. 32 its ultimate application guarding against mistake." On "mystery," see chap. iii. 3.—R.]

But I.—Ἐγώ is used only with emphasis (WINER, p. 144), and must have an antithesis, which the context gives; here it is (ver. 33); "you." Δέ, *but*, is merely metabatic (MEYER); therefore: I, the Apostle, the unmarried one.*—**Say it in regard to Christ and the Church** [λέγω εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν].—Λέγειν εἰς marks the aim of the discourse, as Acts ii. 25; Heb. vii. 14; John viii. 26 (WINER, p. 370). Here λέγειν is the expression of the opinion and view of Paul, who refers the mystery to "Christ and the Church" as the archetype and prototype for Christians in the marital fellowship. The repetition of the article is emphatic, containing a caution to consider this on account of the consequence for the copy, marriage. It is incorrect to take λέγω=I apply it (STIER), or, I cite it (MEYER; Luther, too, is wrong: of Christ and the Church, and the *Vulgate: in Christo et in ecclesia.* On the Romanist error, which regards marriage as a Sacrament, to which the *Vulgate* gives occasion, see *Doctr. Note* 7.†

Ver. 33. **Nevertheless ye also.**—Πλήν (from πλέον) precisely: further, beyond this, that is beyond the saying on my part, καὶ ὑμεῖς. There is, therefore, no digression to be accepted, from which he now returns to the subject, ver. 28 (BENGEL: *quasi oblitus propositæ rei nunc ad rem revertitur;* HARLESS, BLEEK), nor is it: in order to enter no further upon this mystery (MEYER).‡

Severally, let each one, οἱ καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστος, *vos singuli*, each one without exception; the masculine and the context point to husbands.—**So love his own wife as himself,** τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα οὕτως ἀγαπάτω ὡς ἑαυτόν.—Loving as one's self is a conception, which is compared (οὕτως) with the love of Christ to the Church. [Not so love his wife as he loves himself, but: in this manner (like Christ) love his own wife as being himself; comp. ver. 28.—R.]

And let the wife see that she reverence her husband.—The construction: ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα, presupposes something to be supplied: *volo aut simile quid piam* (Gal. ii. 10; v. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 2; vii. 29; 2 Cor. viii. 7). BENGEL, and answers to an imperative, as indeed one precedes (WINER, pp. 295, 537). It is stronger, however, than an imperative; ἡ δὲ γυνή stands first emphatically. [See ELLICOTT, who accepts a nominative absolute, reaching the same conclusion as Braune. "Let the wife see," brings out the emphasis quite well.—R.] *Particula vim habet, vim temperat ellipsis morata* (BENGEL). Thus a special weight for house and husband is laid upon this, that she does her duty, which is summed up in φοβῆται and traced to its inmost ground in vers. 22-24. ŒCUMENIUS: ὡς τρέπει γυναῖκα φοβεῖσθαι μὴ. δουλοτρεπῶς. See *Doctr. Note* 1, 3, 4. *Optime cohærebit concordia, si utrimque constabunt officia* (ERASMUS). [EADIE well remarks: "What is instinctive on either side is not enforced, but what is necessary to direct and hallow such an instinct is inculcated."—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The fundamental features of the moral conduct of man and wife towards each other* are the principal points in this section. The Apostle refers the subject, with wholesome words and grand freedom from all casuistry, back to the main point, to its briefest expression: *As regards the wife,* to be *subordinate* to the husband (vers. 22, 24), to *reverence* him (ver. 33); as regards the wife, to love the husband (vers. 25, 28, 33). The former is in force since Gen. iii. 15: "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee;" it is not, however, merely a consequence of the fall and a punishment, but inheres in the position of the woman and her corresponding endowment and nature, since she was to be a help-meet for the man, that he should not be alone (Gen. ii. 18). In this is at once implied that there is here meant no servile subjection, no forced, legal obedience, no loveless, joyless fear, by indicating that the man as the head of the wife, in his mind, character and activity is placed as the representative and provider for his own in circles outside that of the house, the context defines the subordination and fear to this extent, that, as soul, heart, disposition and honor of the household, she submits herself to the regulations established by the husband in virtue of his office, and in tender thought avoids disturbing, injuring or destroying his work. Above the house stands the man's avocation, which is from God, for which God has appointed him; hence it stands higher than the house, the character and life of which should subserve his avocation in the house alone. It is therefore in substance commanded that the wife should be subject, and in tender solicitude should fear to oppose the husband, to undervalue his arrangements, to make him discontented or an-

* [The reference is apparently not so much to his celibacy, as to the subjective character of the application and comparison, while the slightly adversative δέ contrasts it with any other interpretation that might have been adduced: "the mystery of this closeness of the conjugal relation is great, *but* I am *myself* speaking of it in its still deeper application, in reference to Christ and the Church" (ELLICOTT).—R.]

† [Our English and American commentators do not fail to notice this blunder of the Council of Trent, but some people who speak English treat the Authorized Version with the same reverence; ministers preach from the *sound* of the E. V., not the *sense* of the Word of God. The Romanist can cover his blunder by the sanction given to the Vulgate by his church, but Protestants have no such excuse.—R.]

‡ [The view of MEYER is accepted by EADIE, HODGE, ELLICOTT, ALFORD, and seems perfectly tenable. Braune's view results from the effort to maintain a decided antithesis to "I" in "ye," when most commentators find the antithesis to "ye also" in "Christ."—R.]

gry while tarrying in the house to strengthen himself for his avocation.*

The wife who refuses this subordination and considerate respect, who does not see and seek her mission in the house, in the service of her husband, becomes an offensive caricature: from discontent there is bad progress to growling, managing, seeking the mastery, scolding, and finally to "emancipation." Thus is stripped off and destroyed, not only what is Christian, but what is germanic, even what is womanly, especially what is peculiar and individual, the special gift of the Creator. JEZEBEL and HERODIAS are examples of this kind. The true character shines in SARAH (1 Pet. iii. 1-6).—To the husband *one* command is given, and in this one three requirements: *Love* even unto *self-sacrifice*, with the consequence and purpose of *sanctification* (vers. 25-27), and this with such energy, purity and constancy, that more is required of the husband than of the wife. The wife should love the husband, as *the Church loves Christ*, in entire, exclusive, indissoluble and *ministering* love, and the *husband* should love the wife, as *Christ the Church*, in entire, exclusive, indissoluble and *protecting* love. It is more difficult to love the wife, without egotism, without tyranny and despotism, without any severity to be the master in the house in true affection, than to be subject to the man in tender respect for his dignity as husband, and his avocation as man.

2. *The combination of marriage and Church* (*Kirche*), which appears as the main thought in this section, has a twofold reference.

a. The two are to be compared with each other: As the wife should conduct herself to her husband, so should the Church to Christ; as the husband should conduct himself to the wife, so does Christ to the Church. Marriage, like the Church (*Kirche*), is a life-fellowship between a head and its body; the former Christ is for the Church (*Gemeinde*) and the man for the wife; the latter, the Church, is for Christ, and the wife for the husband. From the relation and the demeanor between Christ and the Church light falls upon the relation and demeanor of married people to each other, just as from the latter upon the former. Thus marriage and Church serve each other for the rendering clear of that which is normal in the two. But we must guard against descending in this parallelism to small and belittling particulars: such as conjoining winning the bride, baptism, and time of betrothal and the temporal period of the Church, leading home the bride and the Second Advent of the Lord as Bridegroom, sexual fellowship and *unio mystica*. But we may with right speak of the religion of marriage and of the marriage of religion; on this is based, too, the position in the canon of the Song of Solomon, which is a hymn of holy love. The Church should not keep at a distance what appertains to the creature, what is natural, or even turn a disapproving countenance upon it; that would be a wrinkle in the face of the Church, thus despising her Lord's work and so growing old on one side, instead of being glorified. From the wife, who in her husband's house is never to be regarded lightly, but must manage and mould, the Church may and ought to learn how to become at once *deiformis* and *mundeformis*.

b. The two, however, stand in such close relation to each other, *that from the Church proceeds the power for the proper direction of marriage, the proper conduct of married people.* The wife should belong to the Church in order to receive from Christ His gifts, that thus she may be to her husband what the Church is to Christ, and quite as much must the husband be sanctified in the Church, taken hold of by Christ and permeated by His love, in order to treat his wife, as Christ does His Church. Thus the Christian Church is the foundation for a normal marriage, as the natural life becomes in the life of regeneration that which is according to God's will.

3. *Marriage and Nature.* Our section points into the sphere of creation. The man is from the beginning made for marriage (Gen. i. 26-28: "male and female"), and in Paradise the first human pair was brought together for wedlock, were wedded pair by the grace of God, before father and mother, and children existed. Marriage is the first union in point of time. And in point of dignity as well: from it proceeds the dignity of father and mother, through it alone comes family life, the basis of all blessing in human life. As to its nature it is the fellowship

* [HODGE: "The ground of the obligation as it exists in nature is the eminency of the husband; his superiority in those attributes which enable and entitle him to command. He is larger, stronger, bolder,—has more of those mental and moral qualities which are required in a leader. This is just as plain from his history as that iron is heavier than water. The superiority of man, in the respects mentioned, thus taught in Scripture, bounded in nature, and proved by all experience, cannot be denied or disregarded without destroying society and degrading both men and women. The superiority of the man, however, is not only consistent with the mutual dependence of the sexes, and their essential quality of nature and, in the kingdom of God, but also with the inferiority of men to women in other qualities than those which entitle to authority. The Scriptural doctrine, while it lays the foundation for order in requiring wives to obey their husbands, at the same time exalts the wife to be the companion and ministering angel to the husband.' As a proof that this is the position assigned to woman by her own mind and heart, we may cite the works of imagination written by the most brilliant of the sex. Their *ideal of man*, even when they write, personating the other sex, is one who from his nature *demands* their loving obedience. If it be said that many a woman is joined to a man, whose character does not thus demand the obedience of the superior mind, we must consider how often women accept the relation of wife, with a full knowledge of the right position, as taught by God in nature and in His word, and yet conscious that they neither can nor will occupy that position to the man who becomes their legal husband. Such are punished in this life, and the cry about "the subjection of woman" is often the wail of distress resulting from such punishment.—As regards the relation of the sexes in general, though nothing is expressly said in this section, much may be inferred. No doubt great mistakes have been made in drawing such inferences, but it is perfectly obvious that a distinction between the sexes is here assumed, which distinguishes, if it does not sharply divide, the sphere of duty belonging to each respectively. "Woman's work" is different from man's work, though care should be taken neither arbitrarily to exclude her from certain kinds of labor, nor to deprive her of her just recompense for her work. The Church, too, should find work of a certain kind for many who are not "wives," by constituting them "Bible-readers," "deaconesses;" the mere office of Sunday-school teacher will not satisfy many such, since for that many are not adapted. —In regard to the question of "suffrage," it is a fair inference from our passage, that for a wife to vote independently would be a disturbance of the relation as ordained by God; the question assumes a slightly different phase in regard to unmarried women of full age. Still even in the case of such, the passage at least lays the *onus probandi* on those who advocate the right. One popular argument urged in favor of "women suffrage" is that thus drunkenness could be stopped by force of law. But not only is that method of doubtful justice, legality and expediency, but the question fairly arises how many men are driven to drunkenness by the failure of their wives to heed the spirit of the Apostle's words. —R.]

of one man and one woman, in which both more and more live together (*εἰς σάρκα μίαν*), chiefly moral, then however sensuous vital fellowship even to sexual fellowship; it is the fellowship of the body and of the worship of God, of all worldly goods, of all intellectual gifts, and, as far as it is possible with personal reason and conscience, of spiritual gifts also; the religious side of the fellowship should predominate, the moral side operate, the sensuous side may never override and repel the others, would enter only but not be repressed.*

4. *Marriage and Bible* are joined together also by our section, since it refers back to the oldest Scripture, deriving thence these thoughts: God has created mankind for marriage; the desire, the initiative, is on the side of man, the being desired is the part of the woman; marriage unites only one man and one woman (Monogamy); is first of all and as to its deepest ground directed to moral fellowship of life, includes in itself sexual fellowship, is directed thus towards the establishment of the family and family life, toward the bringing up and education of children; has such an inwardness and fervor, that devoted conjugal surpasses filial love, even father's and mother's love, that the marriage tie is indissoluble, unless sin should rend it asunder.† *Monogamy* is established from the beginning as self-evident. A Cainite, the bold and sensual Lamech, who first took two wives, Ada (=ornament) and Zillah (=shadow of the head of hair), begetting the master of fiddlers and fifers, and the master of workers in brass and iron, made the transition from monogamy to polygamy, and in the progress of civilization forsook the Divine institution (Gen. iv. 19-24). The impatience of Sarah for an heir caused her to forsake her position and conduct so far as to lead Hagar to Abraham, and the selfishness of Laban made use of the love of Jacob for Rachel, so that he took Leah first, but the promised blessing came only on the child of the legitimate wife (Isaac, not Ishmael) or of the first one (Judah, not Joseph). See HARLESS, *Ethik.*, § 52, p. 5, 7 ff. Hence it should not be said, that in the Old Testament marriage only gradually lifted itself to monogamy (SCHENKEL); on the contrary the latter was recognized as the original institution appointed by God, and the defections from it are referred to sinful tendencies, to the dominion of sin, are not approved. Christianity however has glorified marriage, establishing it firmly and securely in its nature, dignity and blessing. Redemption goes back to the natural institutions established in creation, removing the perversions and degradations introduced by sin into the heathen world and the people of Israel; what is new in Christianity is what is primeval restored. This appears especially prominent in the matter of marriage and family life, so strongly that all which is anti-christian and anti-scriptural is at the same time unnatural and inhuman, just as the impulse of anti-christian Atheism, Materialism, Satanism has led thither. Interest attaches to the view of Melancthon, who, much as he has prized his excellent betrothed, was afraid of married life, lest he might thereby be drawn too much away from his studies, and yet afterwards despite a wife suffering from hypochondria and a numerous family called the marriage state "a kind of philosophy, which required duties the most honorable and most worthy of a noble man." [So JEREMY TAYLOR: "Single life makes men in one instance to be like angels, but marriage in very many things makes the chaste pair to be like Christ" (*Sermon on the Marriage Ring*).—R.]

5. Beside the conduct of married people to each other and the relation between Christ and His church and the husband with his wife, there is also marked, through the purpose of Christ or the aims of the church, *the end of marriage*, viz., *the sanctification of the personality* (vers. 26, 27). This is a process of development, ever deepening and extending through the whole life, with two sides: internal, moral perfection, through growth and unfolding of talent and strength granted (*ἁγία*) and ever wider and clearer emancipation from all evil imposed and entering or clinging from without (*ἄμωμος*). The former is based upon the internally and correctly established relation of the person to God and His kingdom, the latter upon the conduct of the same, externally corresponding to the given noun, in all the relations of life from work to word and its source in thought and temper. Hence the sanctification of the sexual appetite can be regarded as only a single purpose, for which there is not even a point of resemblance in the parallel with the church and her Head, not as the principal task of Christian family morals (SCHENKEL), as if marriage were ordained as a safeguard against whoremongery or carnal excess, when this is but a single object, or rather a coincident result, even though the main matter in

* [Dr. HODGE remarks on the true expression of the Apostle "as their own bodies," (ver. 28): (1.) It does not refer to any material identification. (2.) It implies nothing inconsistent with the separate subsistence of husband and wife as distinct persons. (3.) The marriage relation is not essential to the completeness or perfection of our nature in all states of its existence. It is to cease at the resurrection. (4.) It is not however merely a union of interests and feelings. In a certain sense husband and wife complement each other. (5.) There is doubtless involved a oneness of life which no one can understand.—R.]

† [Here Dr. HODGE is excellent: (1.) Marriage is a union for life between one man and one woman; consequently bigamy, polygamy, and voluntary divorce are all inconsistent with its nature. (2.) It must be entered into freely and cordially by the parties, i. e., with the conviction that one is suited to the other (and it may be added, to take the positions involved in the natural and scriptural view of the relation). All coercion on the part of parents is contrary to the nature of the relation; and all marriages of mere convenience are opposed to the design of the institution. (3.) The State can neither make nor dissolve the marriage tie. It may enact laws regulating the mode in which it shall be solemnized and authenticated, and determine its civil effects. It may shield a wife from ill-usage from her husband, as it may remove a child from the custody of an incompetent or cruel parent. When the union is, in fact, dissolved by the operation of the Divine law, the State may ascertain and declare the fact, and free the parties from the civil obligations of the contract. It is *impossible* that the State should have authority to dissolve a union constituted by God, the duties and ordinances of which are determined by His law. (4.) According to the Scriptures, as interpreted by Protestant churches, nothing but the death of one of the parties, or adultery, or wilful desertion can dissolve the marriage contract. When either of the last-mentioned causes of dissolution is judicially ascertained. the injured party is free to contract a new marriage. The greatest social crime, next to murder, which any one can commit, is to seduce the affections of a wife from her husband, or of a husband from his wife: and one of the greatest evils which civil authorities can inflict on society is the dissolution of the marriage contract so far as it is a civil contract (for further the civil authority cannot go), on other than Scriptural grounds.—R.]

this work of sanctification. From the very seeking and consummating of the marriage, the morality of the fellowship not its sensuousness, the religiousness of the married pair not the sexual fellowship, should show itself to be the decisive and impelling feature. The proper sexual pleasure to be allowed by man and wife must like every other pleasure within a social relation find its norm in accordance with the moral end of marriage.

6. On the phrase respecting baptism (ver. 26) rests with full right the explanation of Luther in the smaller catechism, 4 main part, 1: Baptism is not mere water, but it is water taken in God's command and united with God's word. For it is a pledge of the power of the atonement efficient through awakening and growing faith, an assurance of the forgiveness of sins, a guarantee of the new relation to God, of sonship with Him (Matt. xxviii. 19: *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*; Acts ii. 38; xxii. 16; Heb. x. 22) and an assurance of the power, to be received in faith, of the new life in the gift of the Holy Ghost (John iii. 5; Tit. iii. 5); both together, Rom. vi. 3–11; Col. ii. 12. CHEMNITZ: *Pater salvat, filius emundat, spiritus regenerat* (HARLESS). *Mundatio præcedit donationem gloriæ et nuptias* (BENGEL).—Thus both the mechanical view of baptism as a mere initiatory rite among the Rationalists, and the Baptist sundering of sanctification and cleansing, which makes of baptism merely a seal of entire conversion, are here opposed; it stands at the commencement of sanctification, which begins with it. [The reference to baptism is undeniable, and such a reference seems to contradict at once the very low view of the ordinance which is quite prevalent among many Pedo-baptists, just as the obvious reference to the mystical union of Christ, and His Church in this section implies that the Lord's supper is more than a mere memorial service. As a specimen of the Reformed or Calvinistic views on this subject (though Calvin himself was more of a Sacramentalist than those who moulded the Reformed confessions), the remarks of Dr. HODGE are presented: When the Scriptures speak of baptism as washing away sin, they do not teach (1.) That there is any inherent virtue in baptism, or in the administrator, to produce these effects; nor (2.) That these effects always attend its right administration; nor, (3.) That the Spirit is so connected with baptism that it is the only channel through which He communicates the benefits of redemption. Positively he remarks: (1.) Baptism is a Divine institution. (2.) One of the conditions of salvation, not *sine qua non*, but having the necessity of precept. (3.) A means of grace, that is, a channel through which the Spirit confers grace; not always, nor upon all recipients, nor is it the only channel, nor designed as the ordinary means of regeneration. (4.) Infants are baptized on the faith of their parents; and their baptism secures to them all the benefits of the covenant of grace, provided they ratify that covenant by faith.—R.]

7. Here, as also in i. 8; iii. 3, 9; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Rev. i. 20, the *Vulgate* has rendered *μυστήριον*, *sacramentum*. This translation has been used to support the view of the high dignity of marriage recognized in this section, which exaggerates it to such an extent that the Roman Church, in opposition to her own doctrine of the celibacy of the clergy and the virginity of the saints, proclaims it a sacrament. Comp. *Conc. Triden.*, *Less.* 24, *cap.* 1; *Si quis dixerit, matrimonium non esse vere et proprie unum ex septem legis evangelicæ sacramentis a Christo domino institutum, sed ab hominibus in ecclesia inventum, neque gratiam conferre: anathema sit.*

This church (*Catech. Rom.* ii. 8, 23 sqq.) accepts three gracious gifts [in this so-called sacrament]: *proles, fides, fidelitas quædam und vinculum, quod nunquam dissolvi potest.* As respects the matter and form the schoolmen vacillate in consequence of the novelty of the subject. BONAVENTURA finds the material of the sacrament in the sexual acts, others in the partners themselves, others in their *consensus.* To regard and treat matrimony as a Sacrament, but only for the laity, who do attain to the perfection of the saints, while celibacy is demanded of the monk and priest, that they may be able to boast of sanctity, of actual renunciation of sexual desire, was only possible, because the antithesis between heaven and the world, from which Paul proceeds in speaking of celibacy as respects his own office, age, and individuality (1 Cor. vii. 25–40), was changed into an antithesis of spirit and flesh in such a way that a false dualism was established between Divine and human, spiritual and carnal, moral and natural. This dualism the church has overcome. Very apt are the remarks of HARLESS (*Ethik*, p. 512): "Marriage is the divinely appointed ordinance and form, within which the spirit of Divine love can find on earth according to the nature of the case its most unhampered rule, and in such efficiency can best give a measure of the fulness of the Divine love; *but the marriage itself does not bring or become the medium of this Spirit of pure Divine love.* It is only the vessel which is prepared for this Spirit; the spirit and the power do not come from the earthly copy of the Divine fellowship of love. The Christian perceives rather, that the institution in itself does not at all protect against violation and desecration through selfishness of every kind—but that [the Spirit and the power] come from the graces of the New Testament, that these graces do not come to him by means of marriage, but through the word, baptism, the Lord's Supper, repentance and faith, on which account it is impossible for him, under a misunderstanding of Eph. v. 32 to call the Divine institution of matrimony a sacrament in the sense, in which Baptism and the Lord's Supper are thus termed.—Still the evangelical church down to the latest times has not been free from Romish distortions, of a mystical, theosophic tendency; GOTTFRIED ARNOLD held the marriage state to be incompatible with true wisdom, though he himself afterwards married; with him agreed MICHAEL HAHN, who with his followers remained unmarried, and Pastor CULMANN (*Ethik*, i. p. 42). LUTHER himself did not regard the sexual propensity and its gratification as in itself God-willed (KOESTLIN: *Luther's Theologie*, II. p. 483). On the other hand ZINZENDORF attempted to place the marital obligation under ideal points of view.—If from the Roman Catholic side attacks are still made upon the

convenience of Luther and Melancthon for their approval of the bigamy of Landgrave Philip after the example of Abraham, who had however to suffer severely on this account, it may be replied that the Catholic Church not only permitted Abbe Sieyes and Bishop Talleyrand to marry, and dissolved Napoleon's first marriage with Josephine, but even helped him to the second marriage with the Austrian Archduchess.

8. In the 13th century the Old Testament age, and the Old Testament Scriptures were often termed the "*die alte Ehe*" (the old marriage). This points to a mystery of marriage, like that of the communion of Christ and His Church. The former is a mystery on its natural side from the very creation; in it creative powers for soul and body are active; a mystery on the side of redemption: in it wonderful confiding love and consecrated fidelity are manifested; on the side of sanctification: in it operate sanctifying powers for eternity.—Comp. Paul Gerhart: *Voller Wunder, voller Kunst, voller Weisheit, voller Kraft, voller Hulde, Gnad' und Gunst, etc.*

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Comp. the foregoing *Doctr. Notes* and Braune, *Die heiligen* 10 *Gebote*, pp. 147, 177.—The husband has a great advantage over his wife: he is the older, more mature part, has the choice of the wife, possesses greater power and culture for civil life, must represent his wife and household in these matters (1 Cor. xi. 7–9). So at least it should be. But he has no advantage as regards the Divine image and moral worth over her, the fellow-heir (1 Pet. iii. 7). Both must have patience with each other, but no wife should be ever for having the last word without yielding! She who patiently bears puts to shame the despotism of a husband. Nor should they spoil each other by a weak and false silence respecting unpleasantness; they should inure themselves in the draught of truth, should be confiding without inconsiderateness; neither dare cease to be a lover of the other. Even if the husband should be lacking in what is necessary to fill personally his position, the wife should not in boastfulness despise the social dignity of the husband, but above and beyond him see the Lord. Have you given your "yes," then it must be held good to the end; even if it is hard, the difficulty does not dissolve it; life must fulfil it, death alone dissolve it.—You may be *married* and yet not truly *wedded*, may have one household and yet no matrimonial fellowship; may be with him or her *one flesh*, but not *one heart* and *one soul;* you live together under one roof, but may have no common foundation, may walk united on earth, but heaven is wanting to your union.—No one ought to rejoice so much in Christ and His church as the wife: she and her children have gained most by Christianity; this is a reason why women and children have and ought to have so strong an attraction to Him in the church; there is gratitude involved. Submission, ministering subordination is no misfortune, but a joy, exercising a triumphing, pacifying power.—In one sense every man must die for his wife: he must die to himself, to his sinful Ego, mortify his selfishness and egotism, not his peculiarity, which he should still exercise without self-will. The man is most apt to do this as betrothed and in the honeymoon, as if once were enough. But this should occur throughout life: before death no one is entirely done with it.—Wo to him who chooses before he has to choose, when he knows neither why nor wherefore, or before he knows how to choose, when he does not know what it means, or who chooses arbitrarily, before he has bethought himself what his position requires or proved her whom he chooses! Wo to such, especially if they are or become ministers of the church. Sin separates from God, disturbs the union with Him, grieves the Holy Spirit. Sin does this also to the Divine institution of marriage. All separation of dispositions, all disturbances and discord of soul come from sin, and never merely from that of the other, but from your own sin also. The guilt in unhappy marriages, or even in the disturbance of otherwise happy ones, is on both sides, demands at least an examination of one's own sins. When there is discord and even when the other is wrong, do you listen attentively to what is said against you, and then try it as a judge upon yourself.—Never forget this: what is yours does not merely belong to you, you belong to it also.

Starke:—How then can a godless man with alacrity be the head of his wife and require obedience of her, when he neither clings nor listens to Christ, his head?—Pious widows, you have lost one head, but the other Head (Jesus) death cannot take from you; He watches and cares for you.—Is Christ the Head of the church, then the Pope cannot be it, else the church would have two heads and so be a monstrosity.—In Christ there is at once a Head and a Saviour; the two characters must unite also in a husband who should use his dominion for the blessing, never for the oppression and damage of those whom he rules.—The fellowship of believers with Jesus gives them that great dignity, noble advantage and blessed consolation.—Without love marriage is a bitter state, with love it is sweet.—The love of Christ to His church is both cause and standard of the love of husbands towards their wives.—Love and fear stand beside each other in a well-ordered marriage: the former must sweeten the latter, the latter must ever more incite the former.

Rieger:—The Apostle begins with married people, because, if things go wrong between them in the household, the trouble soon extends itself from them to the children and dependents. In each relation the Apostle begins with the weaker side.—Proper distrust of one's self and what is doubtful in one's natural gifts, willingness to be told what to do rather than to lead the other into temptation, is the root of this subjection.—The rule of the household is not to be put on a magisterial footing, but to be conducted by a mild and yet efficient influence, like that of the head upon the members.—What is set before the husbands: love your wives, is not easier than the being submissive. Whoever knows human nature, how loveless, changeful, easily wearied by faults, quickly angered it is, will notice how deep the foundation must be laid for a love which is not puffed up, seeketh not her own, etc.

Heubner:—Even with love and similarity of

hearts there must be subordination. The household needs guidance and government. The wife should submit. The wife's government reverses the proper order.—Nothing can frighten a Christian heart from divorce more than this thought: It is as if you separated from Jesus. Unbelief, coldness toward Jesus has terribly wasted our married life.

PASSAVANT:—The Greeks acted more humanly, the Romans and Germans more magnanimously; elsewhere we see everywhere in the history of humanity the mothers and daughters of the nations, the weaker part, despised and oppressed by the stronger, often most cruelly degraded; and we should have, in such traits of ancient and modern heathen, and of all infidel nations and races, enough to perceive how deeply the whole human race has fallen from its original nature and destiny and what rudeness and wickedness of sin has permeated all nations and men, seeing they all have sinned.—With the appearance of the Redeemer, however, a new hour of Redemption struck also for this so misunderstood and oppressed half of the human race.—The more true, wise and manly the husband is in his cherishing of his wife, as *his own body*, the sooner, and if the wife is not altogether unholy in heart—the more faithfully, tenderly and sacredly will all be returned to him by the wife's sacredly affectionate care and solicitude, and he be richly recompensed.

STIER:—The church should never demean itself as merely *parallel* to other circles of fellowship, for she is called to become the inmost of all.—From out of the family, the concentrated life of the household, where a filial spirit is born of wedded love and household dependents regulate themselves accordingly, the moral life of a nation also grows.—The emancipation of the strong-minded woman, that most repulsive miscreation of natural corporealness, destroys not only what is Christian but what is germanic.—Love is the only right dominion; there is then in every house a church *in parvo*.—The Word is the proper, continuing baptism.—The mystery of marriage is a portico to the mystery of the sanctuary; from the latter too a light streams into the former.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—On the Christian conduct of marriage: 1. In marriage there is something *earthly* and something *heavenly*, which are one. There is marriage in an *anxious* form, when only one is satisfied, the other constrained; merely a carefully kept contract. There is marriage in a *repulsive* form, when the parties are accustomed to each other making as few claims as possible on each other, seeking their pleasure outside. There is a marriage in a loathsome form, when there is mutual anger and bitterness.—Ever more aroused in spirit, mollifying each other, and that in household, social life with its possessions, joys and sorrows.—2. In it there is an *inequality*, which *loses itself in perfect equality*—in perfect oneness of life.

BECHER:—Look at your households, fathers and mothers, for you are priests; your congregations impose a hundredfold greater responsibility than mine. Your priesthood is from God's own hand.—HOFMANN (ver. 22-24): The marriage state the school of Christian obedience; its ground, character, measure and aim.—(Vers. 25-29): The marriage state the home of love on earth—of born, free, heavenly love.

[HODGE:—Ver. 22. The obedience of the wife terminates on the Lord, and therefore is religious, because determined by religious motives and directed towards the object of religious affections. This makes the burden light and the yoke easy; for every service which the believer renders to Christ is rendered with joy and alacrity.—Vers. 26, 27. The church the bride of Christ. 1. The object of a peculiar and exclusive love. 2. She belongs exclusively to Christ 3. The relation more intimate than between Him and any other order of creatures. 4. The church the special object of delight to Christ.—Ver. 29. A man may have a body which does not altogether suit him. He may wish it were handsomer, healthier, stronger, or more active. Still it is *his* body, and he treats it as tenderly as though it were the best and loveliest man ever had. So a man may have a wife whom he could wish to be better, or more beautiful, or more agreeable; still she is his wife, and, by the constitution of nature and ordinance of God, a part of himself.—Ver. 33. The sentiments which lie at the foundation of the marriage relation, which arise out of the constitution of nature, which are required by the command of God, and are essential to the happiness and well-being of the parties, are, on the part of the husband, that form of love which leads him to cherish and protect his wife as being himself, and on the part of the woman, that sense of his superiority out of which trust and obedience involuntarily flow.—R.]

[EADIE:—Ver. 22. In those days wives when converted and elevated from comparative servitude, might be tempted, in the novel consciousness of freedom, to encroach a little, as if to put to the test the extent of their recent liberty and enlargement.—The insubordination of wives has always been a fertile source of sorrow; and yet Christian ladies in early times drew forth this compliment from Libanius, the "last glory of expiring paganism": *proh, quales feminas habent Christiani!*—Ver. 23. There is only one head; dualism would be perpetual antagonism. Each sex is indeed imperfect by itself, and the truest unity is conjugal duality.—Ver. 24. In the domestic economy, though government and obedience certainly exist, they are not felt in painful or even formal contrast; and, in fact, they are so blended in affectionate adjustment, that the line which severs them cannot be distinguished. The law of marital government is an "unwritten law."—Ver. 25. Husbands are not to be domestic tyrants; but their dominion is to be a reign of love.—The church did not crave Christ's love: He bestowed it. It was not excited by any loveliness of aspect on the part of the church, for she was guilty and impure, unworthy of His affection. Who can doubt a love which has proved its strength and glory in such suffering and death?—Ver. 27. As He originally loved her in her impurity, how deep and ardent must be His attachment now to her when He sees in her the realization of His own gracious and eternal purpose!—Vers. 31, 32. So close and tender is the union between Christ and His church that the language of Adam concerning Eve may be applied to it. These primitive espousals afforded imagery and language which might aptly and truly be applied to Christ and the church, which

is "of His flesh and of His bones;" and the application of such language is indeed a mystery—a truth, the secret glory and facility of which are known but to those who are wedded to the Lord in a "perpetual covenant."—Ver. 33. "He rules her by authority, and she rules him by love: she ought by all means to please him, and he must by no means displease her" (*Jeremy Taylor*). When this balance of power is unsettled, happiness is lost, and mutual recrimination ensues. "A masterly wife," as Gataker says, "is as much despised and derided for taking rule over her husband as he, or yielding to it."—R.]

[In view of the well-known fact that an immense proportion of the conversation of many women is about their husbands, their children and their servants, showing how their lives are bound up in these relations, it would be well for them to study (and for pastors occasionally to teach in a prudent way) what the Apostle says in this part of the Epistle (chap. v. 22—chap. vi. 9) about their duties as wives, mothers and mistresses.—R.]

---

b. Children and parents.

CHAP. VI. 1-4.

1, 2 Children, obey your parents in the Lord:[1] for this is right. Honor thy father
3 and [thy][2] mother; which is the first commandment with promise; That it may be
4 well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth. And, ye fathers, provoke
[or fret] not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture [discipline]
and admonition of the Lord.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 1.—[Lachmann, Rueckert, and Mill omit ἐν κυρίῳ on the authority of B. D.[1] F., some fathers. It is bracketted by Alford; but Harless, Meyer, Ellicott accept it on the strong support of ℵ. A. D. [2 3] K. L., nearly all cursives and versions, express statement of Chrysostom; especially since, as Meyer urges, we would have found ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ in case of an insertion from v. 22, and if from Col. iii. 20, it would have been placed after δίκαιον. Braune's note here speaks of the absence of the phrase in Col. iii. 20, a manifest error.—R.]

[2] Ver. 2.—[The E. V. omits "thy," without reason and unfortunately, for the article occurs in the Greek, and the same emphasis rests on *thy mother* as on *thy father*.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The precept for children; vers. 1-3. Ver. 1. **Children**, τὰ τέκνα.—The next step from the married state is the family. The wedded pair become parents through God's gift, which may also be denied. The address to children in a letter to the Church presupposes, that the Apostle regards them as belonging to the Church, present at public worship, understanding the word read to and applicable to them; indeed they must be regarded as baptized, since ver. 1: "in the Lord," ver. 4: "in the admonition of the Lord," obliges us to do so (STIER, HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 192.)* See *Doctr. Note* 1.

Obey your parents in the Lord [ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονεῦσιν ὑμῶν ἐν κυρίῳ].—The verb coming first has the emphasis: this one precept comprises the main part of filial duty in itself. The word is stronger than ὑποτάσσεσθαι (BENGEL: *id plus etiam dicit quam subordinamini; obedire est imperitioris: subordinari cujusvis inferioris*). To the more mature and experienced persons, who are God's representatives and the child's supporters, and guides in fidelity, love and wisdom, obedience is to be rendered, not because they are Christians, or good and rich, or masters over the child, but because they are the parents ("your parents"), with the duty of bringing up (ver. 4) as they have brought forth. As Christians the children, however, must obey "in the Lord," in Christ (vers. 10, 21; ii. 21; iv. 1, 17; v. 8; WINER, p. 364); analogous to "in the fear of Christ" (v. 21), "as to the Lord" (v. 22). Thus the kind of obedience, not immediately and chiefly the kind of parents, is more closely defined, as specifically Christian in ground, measure and limit. It is incorrect to take it as=κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον (THEODORET), or to refer it to God (CALVIN), *in Deo*, or to connect it with "parents," or to take it as merely a designation of the mode of obedience (HARLESS).*

For this is right [τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι δίκαιον].—Quickly, briefly Paul presses the proof (γάρ) forward. "This" refers to the whole: the obedience of children to their parents in Christ. In τέκνα and γονεῖς there is a reminder of the μυστήριον (ver. 32), which lies in

* [To this MEYER objects, but in its stead lays down a principle which approaches the strict Reformed view: "The children of Christians through their vital fellowship with their Christian parents were even without baptism ἅγιοι (see 1 Cor. vii. 14; Acts xvi. 15) and should render to their parents obedience ἐν κυρίῳ."—R.]

* [HODGE seems to follow HARLESS, but EADIE, ELLICOTT, ALFORD rightly take ἐν κυρίῳ as indicating the sphere or element of the action. ALFORD adds, in reference to the common view that the Apostle gives a hint as to commands not according to the will of God: "I should rather believe, that he regards both parents and children as ἐν κυρίῳ, and the commands, as well as the obedience, as having that sphere and element. How children were to regard commands *not answering to this description*, would be understood from the nature of the case." Certainly, if the reference be, as is thought by most, to baptized children, then this presupposes the parents ruling "in the Lord." On the limits of obedience, ELLICOTT refers to TAYLOR, *Duct. Dub.* III 5, Rule 1 and 4 ff.—R.]

the τόκος and γονεία (STIER). Hence δίκαιον, "right," refers to the relations both as given in nature and ordained by Divine law. BENGEL: *etiam natura;* MEYER: according to nature and law. This LUTHER wishes to express with his "it is proper." It should not be referred to the Divine law alone (THEODORET, MEYER, SCHENKEL), to which prominence is given in the next verse. [The natural obligation seems to be brought out here, the enforcement through the Divine law is added in the next verse (so EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, HODGE, following BENGEL, ESTIUS and THEOPHYLACT).—R.]

Ver. 2. **Honour thy father and thy mother.**—This is the commandment, Exod. xx. 12; Deut. v. 16; Matth. xv. 4. In τίμα there is more included than obedience. *Obedientia testimonium est ejus honoris, quem debent parentibus. Sub voce honoris complectitur officia, quibus serio tuam erga parentes observantiam et pietatem sestantur filius* (CALVIN). In Matth. xv. Jesus deduces from the honor the nourishment, and provision and care. Sirach iii. 8. LUTHER: serve, love and esteem. With emphasis the commandment places on an equality over against the children "thy father and thy mother;" in Lev. xix. 3 the latter even comes first.

Which is, ἥτις ἐστίν, introduces a reason, as in iii. 13; it is not=ἥ, *quæ*, but *ut pote quæ.** —**The first commandment with promise.**—Ἐντολή evidently refers to the Mosaic law, the Decalogue, of which what has just been said is one commandment, hence without the article; on the thought that it is a command of God an emphasis rests,† which is strengthened by the added phrase: πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ: at first; it is not *the* first. According to the context it is as respects the time in which it applies to human beings, a first one: children must first *honor God's representatives*, in order to learn how and to be able to keep those which precede and follow (STIER). And it is indeed placed on the promise, conceived in promise, because thus the obedience to parents becomes joyful, and upon this obedience salvation actually rests both internally and externally (1 Tim. iii. 1, 2). BENGEL: *Honor parentibus per obedientiam præsertim præstitus initio ætatis omnium præceptorum obedientiam continet.* It is not necessary therefore to say that it is in the series of commandments the first with a promise (HARLESS and others) [see below], as if there were not a promise annexed to the first or second [the Catholic and Lutheran first, our second] (Exod. xx. vers. 9, 10), or as though it were the first with a promise in the second table (AMBROSE and others). It belongs to the first table, and such a distinction is not "a comment of modern theologians, a distinction not founded in the sacred Scriptures" (ERASMUS), since it is definitely stated in Deut. v. 22, and the tenor of the commandments are distinguished accordingly. (Matth. xxii. 37–40; Lev. xix. 18, 34; Deut. vi. 5; x. 12.) Least of all does πρώτη mean the most important, a chief commandment (KOPPE [HODGE] and others). But while it is incorrect to take ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ=*annexa, addita promissione*, it is quite as much so to understand it as=in point of promise (WINER, p. 366; and others).

[The view of STIER, advocated by Braune, is not altogether satisfactory, that of KOPPE and HODGE is still less so. Nor is any importance to be attached to the absence of the article with πρώτη. The simplest view, one that usually suggests itself to the children, is that of HARLESS and MEYER, accepted by EADIE, ALFORD and ELLICOTT: *first in order;* in point of, involving a promise, the preposition showing that *in* which the priority consists. The second commandment has attached simply "a broad declaration of the great principles of the Divine government," not a specific promise. As regards the difficulty that no commandment follows in the Decalogue with a promise, we may either accept the explanation of HARLESS that "first" refers only to what precedes in this case, or that of MEYER, which finds the rest of the series in other *Mosaic* commands (so ELLICOTT).—R.]

Ver. 3. **That it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth.**—This is the purport of the promise. Exod. xx. 12; Deut. v. 16; LXX.: ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἧς ὁ κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσί σοι. The Apostle only alters: καὶ ἔσῃ μακροχρόνιος, omitting the last relative clause, which as a commandment of God designates, not merely Canaan, but every country appointed by Him as a home, Palestine in the case of the Jews. According to the quotation ἵνα must be retained in the second half with the future, although the conjunctive occurs in the first half. WINER (p. 271) explains the construction with the future as a lapse into a direct discourse, despite similar examples. MEYER finds indicated in the conjunctive the mere actualization, in the future the certain entrance and continuance, hence a logical climax.* Undoubtedly ἵνα is to be taken as telic, and on account of the phrase, "thy father and thy mother," to be applied to individuals, not *toti eorum genti* (BENGEL, who prudently says beforehand: *non tantum singulis;* HARLESS and others). The well being is put in the front rank, the long life in the second. Even among the most decayed people it will go well with him who honors his parents in obedience, and his life will be long, at least *quoad sufficientiam* for eternal salvation (STIER). Godliness has indeed a promise for this life also (1 Tim. iv. 8), but certainly for that which is to come. To limit the promise to the

* [This is the view of MEYER and formerly of ELLICOTT, but the latter now accepts the *explanatory* force of the pronoun, since, as ALFORD intimates, the other view throws "the motive to obedience too much on the fact of the promise accompanying it, whereas the obedience rests on the fact implied in ἐντολή, and the promise comes in to show its special acceptableness to God."—R.]

† [ALFORD's remark *in loco* must be taken with caution. He says the reference is to "the Decalogue, which naturally stands at the head of all God's other commandments; and which, though not formally binding on us as Christians, is quoted, in matters of eternal obligation (not of positive enactment), as an eminent example of God's holy will."—R.]

* [On this ELLICOTT remarks: "The future undoubtedly often does express the more *lasting* and *certain* result (comp. Rev. xxii. 14, where the single act is expressed by the aorist subj., the lasting act by the future); still as the present formula occurs in substance in Deut. xxii. 7 (*Alexand.*), and might have thence become a known form of expression, it seems better not to press the future further than as representing the *temporal evolution* of the εὖ γενέσθαι."—R.]

spiritual possessions of the heavenly Canaan (JEROME, OLSHAUSEN) is incorrect. *Tenerior ætas pro captu suo allicitur promissione longæ vitæ* (BENGEL). The attracting promise is chiefly to be taken in the sense and spirit of children, who hope for a long life; the history of nations and families confirm the truth of the promise. *Hodie æque bene vivunt pii in omne terra, atque Israel olim in illa* (BENGEL).

[We must reject both the generalizing and spiritualizing interpretations of the promise, and accept an individual reference of present validity. On this most recent commentators agree. And the promise is fulfilled in the usual course of providence with obedient children. The only question is: Did the Apostle by omitting the latter part of the commandment, which had a special reference to Canaan, himself apply the promise to obedient children in all lands, or did the original commandment imply this (the given land being the home in every case), so that the Apostle omits the last clause as unessential for his present purpose and really implied in τῆς γῆς? The former is the view of EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, and HODGE, the latter of Braune and others. Either is preferable to MEYER's notion that the Apostle omitted the clause because his readers were familiar with the passage, and understood it in the general sense, though its original reference was only to Palestine.—R.]

The precept for fathers; ver. 4. **And ye fathers.**—Quickly and closely he connects this with καί.* He addresses the "fathers," because he regards the mothers as "submitting to their own husbands" (v. 22, 24, 33), who are their responsible representatives. *Facilius parentes et heri abutuntur potestate sua, quam mariti* (BENGEL); that lies in the freer position of the former. We are not to refer this to grown up children (OLSHAUSEN), since "bring them up" follows; nor is there any oriental depreciation of the mother (RUECKERT), since ver. 2 commands: "honor thy mother," and Gen. xxiv. 67; xxxvii. 10; 1 Kings ii. 19; Judges v. 7; 2 Sam. xx. 19 teach us otherwise.†

The prohibition: **Provoke [or fret] not your children to wrath,** μὴ παροργίζετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν.—It is parallel to the παραζηλοῦν, Rom. x. 19; it is explained by Col. iii. 21 (א.: παροργίζετε, others: ἐρεθίζετε—ἵνα μὴ ἀθυμῶσιν). It is the hasty, rough, moody treatment of children, so that, without childish confidence, without joyful obedience, they are repelled and enticed to opposition, defiance and bitterness. Righteous, wholesome parental anger is not excluded, but painful, arbitrary, grumbling treatment, as well as rough, unjust treatment, without sparing the childish nature. [ALFORD: "The Apostle seems to allude to provoking by vexatious commands and unreasonable blame, and uncertain temper, in ordinary intercourse."—R.]

The command: **But bring them up,** ἀλλὰ ἐκτρέφετε αὐτά (v. 29).—This points to children who still require care. But it should not be the mere growing up of the proletarians, but spiritual also. Hence:

In the discipline and admonition of the Lord, ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νουθεσίᾳ κυρίου. Thus the element is denoted in which the bringing up should be consummated.* The former consists in *work*, the latter in *word;* the former is discipline (LUTHER), not merely punishment, also strict ordering of the household, accustoming to self-denial, serviceableness, confession of faults without shuffling. Heb. xii. 6, 7. The latter (LUTHER: admonition) comprises earnest warning (1 Cor. x. 11) and kind exhortation (Tit. iii. 10; Rom. xv. 14; Col. iii. 16; i. 28; 1 Cor. iv. 14; 1 Thess. v. 14; 2 Thess. iii. 15), which evidently predominates over serious rebukes. It is important that the former comes first, and this last. *Harum altera occurrit ruditati, altera oblivioni et levitati; utraque et sermonem et reliquiam disciplinam includit* (BENGEL). [Comp. TRENCH, *Syn.* § xxxii., whose views correspond in the main with those suggested here, and are adopted by EADIE, ALFORD and ELLICOTT.—R.] Hence the first is not general, the training of children in general, the latter special, the reproof for the purpose of improvement (HARLESS, MEYER), nor are they indistinguishable synonyms (KOPPE). The genitive belongs to both words: the Lord does it through the father as His representative; it is therefore a genitive *subjecti.* [So HARLESS, DE WETTE, MEYER, EADIE, HODGE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT and others: the discipline and admonition prescribed by the Lord and to be regulated by His Spirit.—R.] It is not then: to the Lord (LUTHER), nor=well-pleasing to the Lord (FLATT), or=*de Christo* (MICHAELIS), nor are we to accept that the Apostle himself scarcely knew how to explain it (RUECKERT).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The presupposition for the *conduct* of children to parents and parents to children is *the relation of both to Christ.* The children should do their duty "in the Lord" (ver. 1), the parents "in the discipline and admonition of the Lord" (ver. 4), and that too from infancy ("bring them up"). Baptism, infant baptism, is thus presupposed as the basis for the children as well as for the treatment of children. And all the more so, that there is expressed for the children no termination or cessation of their conduct toward their parents and for the parents no beginning of the influence on the children, nor is any hint given of the baptismal act to be effected or experienced, which could scarcely be wanted after iv. 5 ("one baptism"), since the fellowship of the Lord is indicated in the case of children as well as parents. HOFMANN (*Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 193) properly recalls Acts xvi. 15. For before mention was made of the household of the jailer, and without any impression of what had occurred having been made upon his household, it was said to him: "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ

* [ELLICOTT suggests that the particle "marks that obligation was not all on one side, but that the superior also had duties which he owed to the inferior."—R.]

† [EADIE limits this precept to fathers, urging that mothers are apt to spoil the child by indulgence, while fathers are apt to chastise in a passion. But the other view is preferable.—R.]

* [Dr. HODGE, whose comments on this verse are very clear and instructive, falls into his usual error, in taking the preposition ἐν as instrumental: "developing all their powers by the instruction and admonition of the Lord." The thought is rather that the child shall grow up, be *trained in* an element, sphere, atmosphere, etc.—R.]

and thou shalt be saved, and *thy house.*" We should therefore with AUGUSTINE (*De Gen.* X. 23, *Serm.* X.) and ORIGEN (*ad Rom.* vi.) regard infant baptism as an ordinance instituted by the Apostles. It was practised in the days of TERTULLIAN, but no mention is made of its having been introduced. Accordingly our passage refers the nurture of children to the basis of baptism and the family: family education and baptismal education are enjoined. [The relation to Christ rests not on the baptismal act, but on the relation to the believing parents, hence children are to be baptized "as members of Christ's Church" (Ref. Church, form of baptism), are thus publicly acknowledged and sealed as Christian children, whose personal piety is to be looked for in faith just as it is prayed for in faith. Despite all abuse of this Christian truth, it is the truth, and holding it fast we may hope for a piety which rests on an educational, not a spasmodic, basis.—In regard to the apostolic origin of the ordinance, the negative proof is overwhelming. Besides the allusion here and in Acts xvi., it is inconceivable that the Jews, who attacked Paul on every actual point of difference, could have omitted opposition here, had he failed to perpetuate in some distinct form the Old Testament doctrine of covenant blessings on the household.—But as negative proof it leaves room for honest adherence to that marked individualistic form of Christianity, which is necessary, it would seem, for many minds of that cast.—R.]

2. The Apostle requires *obedience* on the part of the children to their parents as God's representatives. This is a manifestation of that honor which God requires. It is established, regulated and limited through Christ, and is the foundation of earthly happiness. While ὑπακούειν denotes obedience as a reverent hearing, listening to the parents' will, not merely in order to know it, but rather to be directed by it, so the German word: *gehorchen* [derived from *horchen*=our English *hearken*], related to *hörig*, *gehörig*, *zugehörig* [all meaning: belonging to, but strengthened in the longer forms], refers to the internal relation of dependence which finds its answering expression in *gehorsam* [obedience]. Both refer to the relation of piety [*i. e.*, filial piety, since piety toward God and parents are recognized as identical in the Latin word *pius*], and include as the innermost motive love, which devotes itself with recognition of the parental dignity, even when parental worthiness is wanting. Over against the will of the parents the will of the child is illegal; but this statement is valid only so far as the parents exercise their will as the representatives of God, and their will is not opposed to God's will. In this there is a hint that the Fifth Commandment belongs to the first table (BRAUNE, *Die heil.* 10 *Geb.* pp. 85–88). This requirement, to agree to the will of parents, does not cease in the course of years, though it receives limitations from the avocation and position of the children, as in the case of our Lord (John ii. 4)

3. *The blessing of the Fifth Commandment* points to this fact, that in God's world and God's government His law, which is in accordance with the whole as well as with each individual part, is and must be of validity, and because it is valid for life, is given in correspondence with the ordinances of His Creation and Providence The blessing is not an arbitrarily placed reward, but a result of obedience, actual and true obedience. One cannot creep into the blessing through constrained or feigned obedience. Obedience, this deeply rooted act of a will, growing morally, is not an affair of selfish calculation, still less can an immoral or demoralizing observance of a natural law be spoken of. Nor is the blessing promised for the life of the earthly family and people to be so lightly esteemed, that it must be transferred to the inheritance of the heavenly Canaan. Welfare and long life will be constantly regarded and used by the Christian as a gift of the gracious God; if something is lacking, he will never murmur nor doubt, as if God did not keep His promise, since our obedience of His commandment is never so perfect that it can be brought into an account with Him; it is rather the case that He has always vouchsafed and still vouchsafes to us more than we deserve.

4. *Christian education* must be consummated *in the family*, and if the family, in which children are born, is broken up by death, or destroyed by social, individual or sinful relations, and made incapable of fulfilling the task of education, each child should still be transferred to a family, or every institution which undertakes the task must be formed as a family.—Christian nurture must begin with the *earliest childhood*, with the beginning of the child's life (ἐκτρέφετε). On this account ἐν παιδείᾳ comes first, and νουθεσίᾳ follows. Matters pertaining to the ordering of the household, to habitudes, to treatment without speaking, even to punishment, come first. Comp Heb. xii. 6; Prov. iii. 11, 12; xxii. 15; xxiii. 13.—But it must add to this and pass over into admonition by word, both alike "of Christ," not i self-will, but under the Lord to whom we are responsible. Hence this education must be Christian.*—Further it connects itself with *baptism;* hence it is *Churchly*. Comp. VON ZESCHWITZ, *System der Christlich Kirchlichen Katechetik*, II. 1, § 2. [More Christian than Churchly however. Hence in those lands where the Church as such must needs control education, there is little gain for the Church or for Christ. Were the family instruction what it ought to be, there is no fear of children becoming irreligious from attending common schools (*i. e.*, schools of the State, not of the Church).—The question of Sunday Schools ought

*[HODGE: "As Christianity is the only true religion, and God in Christ the only true God, the only profitable education is the nurture and admonition of the Lord. That is, the whole process of instruction and discipline must be that which He prescribes and which He administers, so that His authority should be brought into constant and immediate contact with the mind, heart and conscience of the child. It will not do for the parent to present himself as the ultimate end, the source of knowledge and possessor of authority to determine truth and duty. This would be to give his child a mere human development. Nor will it do for him to urge and communicate everything on the abstract ground of reason; for that would be to merge his child in nature. It is only by making God, God in Christ, the teacher and ruler, on whose authority everything is to be believed, and in obedience to whose will everything is to be done, that the ends of education can possibly be attained." But it must still be maintained, that the place where this close contact with Christ as Ruler and Teacher and Saviour is to be brought about is not the school, whether parochial school or Sunday School, but as a rule the *household*, since the command is addressed to "fathers," who, standing *in loco Dei* in the family, should not too readily abdicate from their responsible position.—R.]

to be far oftener studied in the light of this section.—R.]—The *mother* is not excluded, but only subordinated to the *father* (vers. 2, 4). The mother's influence on the formation of character is quiet and deep, reaching both to the tenderest germs and the profoundest depths of the heart. 2 Tim. i. 5.—Finally the individuality of the child must be well considered, and one not be treated as another. Such a difficult task can be performed only in the strength of the Lord, by whom we are ourselves educated.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Comp. *Doctr. Notes* and BRAUNE, *Die heiligen* 10 *Gebote*, pp. 84–106.—True obedience is so difficult, that it becomes possible only to the Christian child in the strength of the developed baptismal grace; not the natural, only the spiritual man is capable of proper obedience and becomes more and more so. On the other hand Christian training is so difficult, that only Christian parents can grant it, and this too without having learned the art, often without being conscious of it.—By the child's cradle you still humbly look up to God; you cannot boast that you have given the child life; must indeed confess that you have imparted sin to them.—Eve preferred her first-born Cain (=weapon) to Abel (=shadow, nothingness).—Be sparing of words in your discipline; let your children obey without asking why and punish rather before than after five years of age, else they will punish you.

STARKE: God joins certain promises to His commandments, that we may be the more willing to live in accordance with them. If obedient children have a promise, disobedient ones have a threatening.—The training of children is an art not easily learned. Parents, you must study this, that you may learn it, and implore this grace from God; but especially must you be watchful over all your own conduct, that you give no bad example to your children; and above all implant the true fear of God in their hearts.—If parents bring up their children to the glory of God and the advantage of the world, that is more and better than to leave them great earthly treasures.

RIEGER: The phrase: in the Lord, leads us to perceive that they must be chiefly guided and impelled therein by God's commandment, the walk of the Lord Jesus on the earth; the hope of future recompense from the Lord; but also that it sometimes requires courage to be obedient in all things, and for the Lord's sake to rise above even the parents who stand in the way.—It is often asked how shall we encourage and incite children to their duty? and it is generally thought that the love of honor and the excitement of this feeling are the best means. But he who in accordance with God's word meets their sense of truth with this thought: *for this is right*, proceeds far more securely. There is often in children a far purer feeling than we suppose, we frequently corrupt it by presenting so many frivolous motives.—With the power of self-will love would never suffice for constant obedience, did it not derive support from reverence.—All promises of God must however be treated believingly, *i. e.*, humbly, for they allow nothing to be extorted from them. *Provoking to wrath* takes place not only through unmerciful beating, but also through other unskilful treatment, even though it often has the appearance of right.—God has Himself given us the best pattern of "bringing up." At first without the sharp condemnation of sin designed in the law He led men by His eye and kept them walking before Him. After the stricter imputation of sin through the law, He guided them through His grace in Christ.

HEUBNER: The forbearance, the mildness, the fairness towards children, which Paul enjoins, consists in this, that one neither unmercifully punishes them on account of faults and infirmities, nor teases them with their education and conversion, but leads them with love and earnestness, removing hindrances, and for the rest commending them to the care of the Lord, who loves children. The child has not yet a very lively sense of sin, hence you must not overdo this matter of conversion.—Thus much is certain: religious culture should begin early; the child's heart can be early won and be influenced by love to Jesus. This is the spirit of Christian nurture, which proceeds without constraint and cannot play much with dogmatics.

PASSAVANT: How difficult for a child's heart is *child-like obedience!* for all are sinners, and in all sin there is self-desire, self-will, opposition.—Ill-bred children rarely become good subjects to the king, good citizens for the State, good brethren, good friends, or good parents to their children.

STIER: The obedience of children is due according to natural and revealed right.—The first school of obedience for man is his relation as child.—The mother's love must compensate when the father's character inclines to severity; the father's earnestness and strictness must step in where the mother's natural tenderness is insufficient.

SCHLEIERMACHER: The nature of filial obedience: 1. From what it should arise: neither hold out rewards, nor threaten punishments; nor gratify froward asking for reasons; solely out of filial respect. 2. On what grounds it is recommended: citing the old promise.

ANACKER: To what education must be directed, that it may bear fruit for time and eternity. 1. That the youth learn proper obedience; 2. That they are led through love to obedience; 3. That mildness and strictness be rooted in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

HOFMANN: The personal work of the parents: anger their greatest hindrance; their surest means: nurture your children into the Lord.—The nurture of the Lord: The fundamental traits and principles of Divine training, presented in the history of salvation from the beginning of our race on and in the conversion of individuals through the training of the Holy Ghost; some applications thence to our training: doing acts of love, blessing (Meyer), preserving from ungodly influences, promising, punishing.—Admonition of the Lord: reminder that Christ should be glorified in the children and that they should become happy men, skilful warriors of God.

ZIMMERMANN: From what you seek in your

children, measure what you owe to them! 1. You desire obedience from them, show yourselves full of love to them. 2. You desire that they honor you, apply to them the right nurture. 3. You desire that they protect and adorn your old age, so help them to inherit the promise: that it may be well with thee and that thou mayest live long on the earth.

[HODGE: Children should obey their parents. This obedience should be in the Lord, determined and regulated by a regard to Christ. The ground of the obligation is: 1. It is in itself right; it is enforced by an express command in the Decalogue, to which a special promise is annexed, vers. 1-3.—Ver. 4. A parent had better sow tares in a field from which he expects to derive food for himself and family, than by his own ill-conduct nurture evil in the heart of a child.—R.]

[EADIE: Ver. 1. The love which Jesus showed to children, when He took them in His arms and blessed them, should induce them, in a spirit of filial faith and fondness to obey their parents, and to regard with special sacredness every parental injunction. And that obedience, if prompted, regulated, and bounded by a sense of religious obligation, will be cheerful, and not sullen; prompt, and not dilatory; uniform, and not occasional; universal, and not capricious in its choice of parental precepts.—Filial obedience, under God's blessing. prolongs life, for it implies the possession of principles of restraint, sobriety, and industry, which secure a lengthened existence.—Ver. 4. Such training leads to early piety, and such is ever welcome to Christ and His Church. For the sun shining on a shrub, in its green youth, is a more gladsome spectacle than the evening beam falling dimly on the ivy and ruins of an old and solitary tower.—R.]

[While ver. 4 does not mean (see *Exeg. Notes*) instruction and admonition concerning Christ, it is still true that a father, who, by proper discipline tempered with love, ever keeps the heart of his children in intimate and trustful allegiance, by his very demeanor teaches lessons concerning Christ and God, that are rarely learned so easily in other ways. Many a son is kept from utter ruin by remembering a mother's love and piety, but happy is he who has had such a father as Paul here sketches in bold outline, for amid every doubt that assails head and heart alike, the reality of that father is an evidence, in kind though not in degree, of what God is to us, which no speculations can overbear.—R.]

---

e. Servants and Masters.

(CHAP. VI. 5–9.)

5 Servants,[1] be obedient to them that are *your* masters [to your masters] according
to the flesh,[2] with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto [to]
6 Christ; Not with [or in the way of] eye service, as men-pleasers; but as the ser-
7 vants of Christ,[3] doing the will of God from the heart; With good will doing
8 service, as[4] to the Lord, and not to men: Knowing that whatsoever[5] good thing
any man doeth [each one shall have done], the same shall he receive[6] of the Lord,
9 whether *he be* bond [bondsman] or free. And, ye masters, do the same things unto
[towards] them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also [their
Master and yours][7] is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 5.—[Literally "slaves;" but as Braune accepts a reference to free servants, and since in any case the injunction has a wider application, the E. V. need not be altered (against Alford). See *Exeg. Notes*.—R.]

[2] Ver. 5.—[Lachmann (ℵ. A. B., a few cursives and fathers) places κατὰ σάρκα before κυρίοις, but Tischendorf and recent editors regard this as a conformation to Col. iii. 22.—R.]

[3] Ver. 6.—[The article before Χριστοῦ (*Rec.*, D.[3] K. L) is omitted by recent editors on the authority of ℵ. A. B. D.[1] F., *etc.*—R.]

[4] Ver. 7.—[The *Rec.* (with D.[3] K. L.) omits ὡς, but it is well sustained and generally accepted.—R.]

[5] Ver. 8.—[The reading of the *Rec.*: ὅτι ὁ ἐάν τι ἕκαστος, is accepted by Griesbach, Scholz, De Wette, Meyer, Tischendorf. Ellicott and others, not so much on external authority (K. L., most cursives, Syriac versions, fathers), as because the very great number of various readings can be best accounted for by regarding this as the original reading. See Ellicott and Meyer, on this point. The second reading in point of preference is that accepted by Lachmann, Rückert, Wordsworth: ὅτι ἕκαστος ὁ ἐὰν ποιήσῃ which is found in A. E. (D.[1] F. G., ἄν); many cursives, Vulgate. B. has ὅτι ἕκαστος ἐάν τι, accepted by Alford; ℵ. has the easiest reading: ἐὰν ποιήσῃ ἕκαστος, while we find in cursives and fathers, ὁ ἐάν τις, ἐάν τις, ἐάν τι, ὁ ἐάν, between ὅτι and ἕκαστος, besides ἄνθρωπος instead of the latter word. The theory of Meyer is simple: The received reading was the original one; but the transcriber passed directly from ὅτι to τι, hence the reading: ὅτι ἕκαστος ποιήσῃ; then came the corrections as above, the greater number tending to prove that ἕκαστος should come last, as in the *Rec.*—The acceptance of the inverted reading of Lachmann or Alford would require this rendering: "that each man if he shall have done any good thing."—R.]

[6] Ver. 8—[The *Rec.* has κομιεῖται, with ℵ.[3] D.[3] K. L., most cursives, fathers, but κομίσεται is now generally preferred on the authority of ℵ.[1] A. B. D.[1] F. The other reading is regarded by many as taken from Col. iii. 25, where however the same variation occurs.—The article before κυρίου (*Rec.*, K. L., cursives) is generally rejected, not occurring in the best uncials.—R.]

[7] Ver. 9.—[The variations are numerous. but καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν is accepted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott. Meyer, Harless, because it has good support (A. B. D.,[1] versions and fathers) and best accounts for the occurrence

of the other readings. א.[1] has ἑαυτῶν, while six other variations (in position or through omission) occur. The *Rec.* (ὑμῶν αὐτῶν) is poorly supported, but probably arose early, as a correction, the reference to the slaves being misunderstood; partial attempts at restoration led to changes in position (see Meyer).—The idea presented, that of a *common Master*, seems to be better preserved by omitting the word *both*, which a literal translation would insert before *theirs*.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The precept for SERVANTS; vers. 5-8. *a. The precept*, ver. 5. *b. Closer definition*, vers. 6, 7. *c. Praise and promise*, ver. 8. Comp. Col. iii. 22-25.

Ver. 5. *The precept.* **Servants,** οἱ δοῦλοι.—In this context this means the domestics, the serving members of the household, as ver. 3: "as the servants of Christ," shows, and ver. 8: "whether bond or free," requires; it includes here the free servants also (BENGEL, STIER, BLEEK), does not refer to slaves alone (MEYER, SCHENKEL).* Thus this section gains its continued validity and importance for all relations of subordination, that of subject and citizen also (GROTIUS: *eadem est ratio in republica et in familia*). The passage says nothing for or against slavery. See *Doctr. Notes.*

Be obedient, ὑπακούετε.—Thus the Apostle places the servants on an equality with the children, in the same dependence upon the masters, who are the parents to the children.

To your masters according to the flesh, τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα.—Thus the masters are designated as bodily (LUTHER) according to Rom. i. 3; ix. 3, 5, where the last phrase denotes external, temporal, earthly relations. There is also thereby involved at the same time the δεσποτεία πρόσκαιρος καὶ βραχεῖα (CHRYSOSTOM) and the limitation of freedom in external relations (CALVIN).†

The obedience is more closely defined: **with fear and trembling,** μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου.—Comp. Phil. ii. 12; 2 Cor. vii. 15; 1 Cor. ii. 3. This is *sollicita reverentia*, which has in mind as regards the masters the copied majesty of God, remembering the judgment and recompense before Him. [So HODGE]. It does not refer then to anger and rebuke and punishment (BENGEL), nor is it to be weakened into tender, anxious conscientiousness (OLSHAUSEN, MEYER, SCHENKEL). [So ALFORD, ELLICOTT. EADIE remarks: "The Apostle in the following clauses hits upon those peculiar vices which slavery induces, and which are almost inseparable from it: indolence and carelessness."—R.].

To guard against every misunderstanding there is added: **in singleness of your heart,** ἐν ἁπλότητι τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν.—This not only consists in considering the one interest of the master (HARLESS), but like 2 Cor. viii. 2, 3; xi. 3, includes willingness and the opposite of πανουργία, excluding all untruth. [This phrase sets forth the element (ἐν) of the obedience, as the last phrase expressed its accompanying features. "Singleness" is an apt rendering of the word, which marks that *openness* and sincerity of heart which repudiates *duplicity* in thought or action. On the classical use of the word see HARLESS; comp. TRENCH, *Syn.* II. § vi.—R.] *Quoniam pessimos etiam quosque pœnæ timor cogebat, Christianos servos ab impiis discernit affectu* (CALVIN). It is all to be done: **as to Christ,** ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ, *tamquam* (ERASMUS), not *sicut* (*Vulgate*) *Christo;* v. 22. ["He being the source and ground of all Christian motives and duties" (ALFORD). "As common and secular inducements can have but small influence on the mind of a slave, so the Apostle brings a religious motive to bear upon him" (EADIE). It may be added that if this motive could be brought to bear on the class to whom the exhortation of the Apostle most directly applies in these days when "the workingman's question" is so much discussed, the solution of that question would be less difficult.—R.]

Vers. 6, 7. *Closer definition.* **Not with [or in the way of] eye-service as men-pleasers,** μὴ κατ' ὀφθαλμοδουλείαν ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι.—The first phrase, as the opposite of "in singleness of your hearts," denotes the mode, method, maxim of the service (STIER).* Paul uses the plural in Col. iii. 22: ἐν ὀφθαλμοδουλείαις. THEODORET explains the word as τὴν οὐκ εἰλικρινοῦς καρδίας προσφερομένην θεραπείαν, ἀλλὰ τῷ σχήματι κεχρωσμένην. ŒCUMENIUS also remarks: μὴ ὅταν πάρεισιν οἱ δέσποται καὶ ὁρῶσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπόντων αὐτῶν. The reference is not simply to compulsion, but the appearance of faithful service is designated. They are really "*men*-pleasers," they wish to please men alone, who can only see what is before their eyes; thus they use their master's human weakness to their own advantage. The *studium placendi hominibus* is expressly rejected from the Christian point of view.

The antithesis follows: **but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart.**—The first phrase is opposed to: "as men-pleasers," the second, which characterizes the servants of Christ,† to: "with eye-service." The servants of Christ naturally do the will of God, which is also the will of Christ (John x. 30; v. 30), and that too "from the heart," without discontent with their service or murmuring in their service; this necessarily distinguishes them from others, even from those who may be doing the will of God.‡

* [Nearly all English and American commentators accept the exclusive reference to slaves, bondmen (CONYBEARE); and with good reason, since the word means "slave" over against a hired servant (Luke xv. 17, 19), and since the greater proportion of servants in those days were slaves. Ver. 8 may be quite as readily urged in favor of the exclusive reference. Still the passage has, and was designed to have, a continued validity, which is better indicated by retaining the word "servants."—R.]

† [On the distinction between κύριος and δεσπότης, which Paul uses in 1 Tim. vi. 1; Tit. ii. 21, see TRENCH, *Syn.* xxviii.; it is neglected here probably because the former word was to be used again (ver. 7) in a higher sense, as indeed κατὰ σάρκα implies. The *deduction* from the latter phrase, that spiritual freedom was left intact is generally accepted, though it is doubtful whether the phrase itself implies this.—R.]

* [The preposition marks the *norm* of the action; ELLICOTT: in the way of; ALFORD: In the spirit of. The substantive is one of Paul's coining, occurring only here and in Col. iii. 22. ELLICOTT says: "the more correct form is [illegible]ουλία (D. E. F. G. L. א.)," but does not put it in his text.—R.]

† [RUECKERT makes the first phrase subordinate to the second, removing the comma after Χριστοῦ (so TISCHENDORF, ed. 7, against recent editors generally); but this destroys the obvious antithesis.—R.]

‡ [EADIE, HODGE and ALFORD render: "the slave of Christ,"

Ver. 7. One thing more is added, which completes the last designation: **with good-will doing service, as to the Lord.**—Μετ' εὐνοίας δουλεύοντες marks the personal dependence on the masters, in which they serve them (LUTHER, [E. V.]: "with good-will"), so that they serve them, "as to the Lord," *tanquam domino, i. e. Christo*. This is rendered emphatically prominent by the antithesis: **and not to men**, καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις.—On this account "from the heart" is not to be separated from "doing" (ver. 6) and joined to "doing service" (CHRYSOSTOM, JEROME, BENGEL, HARLESS, STIER), which in that case would unnecessarily receive two adverbial qualifications. [So LACHMANN, DE WETTE and ALFORD (who makes a good defence), but the other view is maintained by TISCHENDORF, MEYER, ELLICOTT, HODGE and EADIE. ELLICOTT, however, defends the view of HARLESS (against MEYER), that ἐκ ψυχῆς seems to mark the relation of the servant to his *work*, μετ' εὐνοίας pointing to his relation to his *master*.—R.] Still less is "with good-will" to be joined with what precedes and this verse rendered: Let yourselves think that you serve the Lord and not men (LUTHER). Thus the precept of ver. 5 has been more closely described and a return made to it.

Ver. 8. *Basis and promise.* **Knowing**, εἰδότες. [ELLICOTT: "seeing ye know."]—Thus Paul refers the servants to their faith, to the certain confidence: **that whatsoever good thing each one shall have done, the same shall he receive of the Lord.**—Ὅτι ὃ ἐάν τι ἕκαστος is grammatically clear: ἐάν often is =ἄν in relative clauses (WINER, p. 291) and ὅ—τι is *tmesis* (BENGEL); ἕκαστος is not to be extended to both masters and servants; the context ("whether bond or free") limits it to those addressed; each one of you. [This view assumes that "bondman or free," refers to two classes of servants, but the more commonly received opinion includes the masters under the latter term, thus giving the verse the character of a general proposition. This is the more obvious reference, and has the advantage of giving an easy transition from the exhortation to the bondman to that to the free man (masters, ver. 9).—R.] In ποιήσῃ ἀγαθόν the verb stands first with emphasis; something depends on the doing; the will of God must be done by you, as well as on you. [The rendering: "shall have done," brings out best the relation to the time of recompense, *i. e.*, the Second Advent of the Lord.—R.] Ἀγαθόν, "good," is only what takes place for Christ's sake, in love and obedience to Him. Τοῦτο is the "good," which the servant has done, and which παρὰ κυρίου κομίσεται, "he shall receive of the Lord." The verb is joined with μισθός, 2 Pet. ii. 13; with ἐπαγγελίαν, Heb. x. 36; xi. 39; and with similar expressions, 1 Pet. i. 9; v. 4; it means: *sibi auferet, reportabit* (ERASMUS), *recipiet* (*Vulgate*) [E. V.: receive], from the Lord, from Christ in the Judgment. [ALFORD: "'This in full,' 'this exactly,' he shall then receive in its value as then estimated, changed, so to speak, into the currency of that new and final state."—R.] Thus the complete recompense is marked (τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας, Col. iii. 24).—**Whether he be bondman or free**, added quickly without a verb; it is better to supply: *fuerit* (ERASMUS), than *sit* (MEYER and others). [ELLICOTT: "Whatsoever be his *social* condition here, the future will only regard his *moral* state." Comp. the citation from CHRYSOSTOM in ALFORD.—R.] From this it cannot be inferred that Paul had not conceived of the cessation of slavery before the Second Advent.

The precept for MASTERS *and its basis*, ver. 9. *a. Positively; b negatively; c. basis.*

Ver. 9. **And ye masters**, καὶ οἱ κύριοι, who are thus recognized, just as "and ye fathers" (ver. 4).—The *positive* precept: **do the same things towards them.**—Τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖτε refers back both to "the will of God from the heart, with good-will" (RUECKERT), and to "submitting yourselves to one another" (v. 21); as the former should serve (δουλεύειν), so the latter should rule (κυριεύειν). He does not require a δουλεύειν from the masters (CHRYSOSTOM). *Amor officia servilia et herilia moderatur* (BENGEL). "Towards them" denotes the equal footing, as was already required in Deut. xv. 12; Levit. xxv. 42, 43; Job xxxi. 13–15, and enlarged in Christ. [EADIE: "The Apostle had stooped to the slave, and he was not afraid to speak with erect attitude to the master. The language is general, and expresses what Calvin well calls *jus analogum*."—R.]

The *negative* precept: **forbearing threatening.**—Ἀνιέντες, placed emphatically first, is according to Acts xvi. 26; xxvii. 40: to leave off, cease from; τὴν ἀπειλήν (Acts iv. 17. 29; ix. 1) they should not only moderate; for the singular does not mean a single threat, but threatening, *minatio* (*Vulgate*). ["Your usual, too habitual threatening" (MEYER, following ERASMUS; so ALFORD and ELLICOTT). The last named author says: "St. Paul singles out the prevailing vice and most customary exhibition of bad feeling on the part of the master, and in forbidding this naturally includes every similar form of harshness."—R.] *Deposita fere a dominis sævitia erat, suscepta fide; nunc etiam minæ remittendæ, ne ostentent servis potestatem suam ad terrendum* (BENGEL). Thus Paul defines the action of the masters according to their disposition; in different forms of action the same disposition. *Æqualitas naturæ et fidei potior est, quam differentia statuum* (BENGEL).

Basis: **Knowing that their Master and yours is in heaven**, εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν κύριός ἐστιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς. [See *Textual Note* [7]].—"Knowing" (as in ver. 8) "that their Master and yours" conceives of both masters and servants as standing on an equality before Him, who helps the latter to their rights and will and can give the former their due. He "is in heaven," *omnipotens*, (BENGEL); before Him earthly power does not appear, is of no value; in His time He comes from heaven as Judge (1 Thess. iv. 16; 2 Thess. i. 7). Hence: **neither is there respect of persons with him**, καὶ προσωποληψία οὐκ ἔστιν παρ'

but this is a harsh expression; ELLICOTT: "bond-servants." The idea of purchase and possession is probably implied.—R.]

αὐτῷ.—The substantive (Rom. ii. 11; Col. iii. 25;* Jas. ii. 1) is used by Paul in every case with reference to the Judgment. This is decidedly excluded, and the phrase suggests what one may expect to receive from Him (*παρ' αὐτοῦ*, ver. 8). Comp. Wisdom vi. 5-9; Gal. ii. 6.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Paul takes occasion elsewhere also to speak of the relations of service and the state of slavery (1 Cor. vii. 21-24; Col. iii. 22-25; 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2; Tit. ii. 9, 10), as does Peter (1 Pet. i. 18-25), without condemning these relations. But sympathizing, in a specially detailed manner, the gospel instructs those who serve, having for them an affectionate heart, an interesting discourse, a consoling word. It does not without further delay declare the slaves free, but it makes them free from within. Paul sent back to Philemon his escaped slave.† In the Church the master remains a master and the slave a slave. The Apostles see in the service of the bondmen, and in the position of servants, though established by wrong and deformed by sin, the fundamental traits of master and servant, as these are established by God. What the ancients already knew, that the slaves participated in the dignity of humanity and had the rights of humanity as well as their masters (SENECA: *servi sunt? imo homines; servi sunt? imo contubernales; servi sunt? imo conservi, si cogitaveris tantundem in utrosque licere fortunæ*), that was not first taught by Christianity. But it brought to masters and slaves *one* Redeemer, in whom both are brethren (Gal. iii. 28; Philem. 16); it wrought upon the disposition from the inner life of faith, so that at once the burden was lightened in Christian families, and in the course of centuries the relations were altered and the state of slavery was done away. Still "it must not be overlooked that Paul's mode of viewing the *already present* relation of freedom and slavery cannot be used to justify slavery *introduced* by Christians, the enslaving of free men, the slave-trade," *etc.* (MEYER). The most modern form of slavery, the Helotism of industry, cannot be viewed in the same way as something existing and historical; it remains a disgrace on which Christianity must prove, whether it is antiquated or retains its eternal powers.

2. The care of the Apostle in teaching servants is for every preacher as well as for the Church an earnest exhortation to take up the oppressed.

3. Servants, subordinates, subjects must, irrespective of the example and conduct of their masters, demean themselves according to the commandment and direction of God. *Benevolentiam, quæ in servo est, ne asperitas quidem heri exstringuit, ut in catellis* (BENGEL).—[The general principles underlying this section are applicable to all relations of employer and employee. The latter is warned against eye-service, exhorted to faithful labor "as in God's sight," bid look to a higher recompense than the temporal wages, because serving a higher master; the former is reminded of the equality before God, how position does not avail before Him, and of the duty to Him involved in the duties of an employer. How many then may study these words with profit. Comp. *Colossians*, p. 79.—R.]

4. The following applies to the masters: *ut Dominus vos tractavit, ita vos tractate servos; aut ut vos tractatis servos, ita ille vos tractabit* (BENGEL).

5. The Judgment of God finally awards strict recompense. ["The Christian doctrine of reward is too often lost sight of or kept in abeyance, as if it were not perfectly consistent with the freest bestowment of heavenly glory" (EADIE).—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

God's service and the master's service.—Eye-servants and God's servants.—Those who serve are a necessary evil for the masters, who are unable by themselves alone to take care of their own, rather than the employers for the servants, who often first learn of them something of order, cleanliness and skill.—*Ernest the Pious* once said: Masters and mistresses can never answer to God, if they keep their domestics away from church-service.—STARKE: Those who murmur and growl in the services, as though weary of them, murmur against God Himself.—Servants can lay up for themselves in continued service a blessing or a curse: a blessing if they faithfully serve in the fear of the Lord, a curse, however, if they act falsely and faithlessly.—A pious serving-man, whose fidelity and industry is not perceived by his employers, and whose wages are improperly withheld or cut down, is known by God, who will give him the best reward.

RIEGER: Compulsory measures, severity and cunning are of no avail. They only make the servants more crafty.—A servant has often nothing in the world but his good name; and anxiety about this can easily lead one into eye-service; but with singleness of heart better progress is made in this direction.—Eye-service spoils the heart, wasting those powers, which would remain united in the fear of the Lord and preserve from weariness also.

HEUBNER: The higher Master frees from slavery. The Lord regards all; servants and slaves are as well-known to Him as masters and princes. Before Him the heart alone gives rank, and even the most trifling services, if rendered with an honest heart, receive their reward. What a transformation the Lord's Judgment will bring about! How much the serving class has to thank

* [In Col. iii. 25, the same thought occurs in the former part of the exhortation, with a slightly different reference therefore. See *Colossians*, pp. 78, 79.—MEYER and ALFORD cite Seneca, *Thyest.* 607: "*Vos, quibus rector maris atque terræ jus dedit magnum necis atque vitæ, Ponite inflatos tumidosque vultus. Quicquid a vobis minor extinescit, major hoc vobis dominus minatur; Omne sub regno graviore regnum est.*"—R.]

† [The reader is referred to the remarks of Dr. HACKETT, *Philemon*, pp. 29 ff., and the extracts there given on the subject of Christianity and slavery. On the general principles which this section implies most commentators agree; and these principles did abolish slavery in the early Christian centuries. Unfortunately there are times when and places where these principles, while theoretically accepted, do not operate toward the desired result; then God's Providence does quickly and retributively what men would not let His gospel do. Still emancipation is not necessarily Christian freedom. The gospel method begins within; the other lays upon Christ's Church the responsibility of so teaching the truth that the "truth may make free" those suddenly released from bondage. That is but the beginning of freedom.—R.]

Christianity! It has made a freer feeling in service and better masters, and effected all this without a violent subversion of relations.—The rough and coarse master makes rough and coarse servants, the gentle master makes gentle servants. The master should not have an imperious, despotic feeling, but a ministering one.

PASSAVANT: This is true, and those who stand high and rule in the world, cannot bethink themselves of it too earnestly and humbly: Before God we are all alike, all of one origin, one nature, one sin—and all partakers of one grace, one redemption, one glory.—You look for so many virtues and perfections in your maid or man; with such conditions do you think you would be worthy or capable of being man or maid-servant?

GERLACH: Obedience to the bodily master should constantly be directed toward Christ.

[EADIE: "And with respect to servants of every denomination, *equity* requires that we treat them with humanity and kindness; that we endeavor to make their service easy, and their condition comfortable; that we forbear rash and passionate language; that we overlook accidental errors, and remit trivial faults; that we impose only such labor as is reasonable in itself and suitable to their capacity; that our reproofs be calm and our counsels well timed; that the restraints we lay upon them be prudent and salutary; that we allow them reasonable time for refreshment, for the culture of their minds, and for attendance on the worship of God; that we set before them a virtuous example, instil into them useful principles, warn them against wickedness of every kind, especially against the sin which most easily besets them; that we afford them opportunity for reading and private devotion, and furnish them with the necessary means of learning the way of salvation; that we attend to the preservation of their health, and have compassion on them in sickness; and, in a word, that we contribute all proper assistance to render them useful, virtuous, and happy" (from LATHROP, *Ephesians*).—R.]

5. Concluding exhortation.

CHAP. VI. 10–20.

10 Finally, my brethren, be strong [Finally be strengthened][1] in the Lord, and in the
11 power of his might [in the might of his strength]. Put on the whole armour of
12 God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle
[our[2] wrestling is] not against flesh and blood, but against [the] principalities,
against [the] powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world [the world-
rulers of this darkness],[3] against spiritual wickedness [the spiritual *hosts* of wicked-
13 ness][4] in high [heavenly] *places*. Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of
God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done [accom-
14 plished] all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt [girt your loins]
15 about with truth, and having [put] on the breastplate of righteousness. And your
feet shod [having shod your feet] with the preparation [preparedness] of the gospel
16 of peace; Above [In addition to][5] all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall
17 be able to quench all the fiery darts[6] of the wicked [evil one]. And take[7] [or
receive] the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of
18 God: Praying always with all prayer and supplication [With all prayer and sup-
plication praying at all times] in the Spirit, and watching thereunto[8] with [in] all
19 perseverance and supplication for all [all the] saints; And for me [or on my be-
half], that utterance may be given[9] unto [to] me, that I may open my mouth
boldly, [in the opening of my mouth, in boldness] to make known the mystery of
20 the gospel,[10] For [or In behalf of] which I am an ambassador in bonds [*literally*
in a chain]; that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 10.—[The *Rec.* reads: τὸ λοιπὸν ἀδελφοί μου, but μοῦ λοιποῦ occurs in ℵ.[1] A. B., 3 cursives, and some fathers; it is accepted by Lachmann, Rückert and Alford, but the other form is retained by Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott on the authority of ℵ.[3] D. F. K. L., most cursives and fathers. Most editors, however, reject ἀδελφοί μου, which is found only in ℵ.[3] K. L. (though in others with the omission of μου, and in a different position) most cursives and fathers; besides the good external authority for the omission (ℵ.[1] B. D. E., good versions), the phrase is open to double suspicion: first, as usually following τὸ λοιπόν, and hence likely to be inserted second, as not used in direct address in this Epistle (Olshausen). Meyer holds that the reading τοῦ λοιποῦ is a mechanical repetition from Gal. vi. 17, urging the insertion of the added phrase in favor of τὸ λοιπόν, (see his critical note).—R.]

[2] Ver. 12.—[Lachmann and Rückert accept ὑμῖν on the authority of B. D.[1] F. G., a few cursives, a number of versions and fathers; but ἡμῖν is very well supported (ℵ. A. D.[3] K. L., most cursives, versions and fathers), while the change to the second person is an apparent correction on account of the individualizing, hortatory character of the passage as a whole.—R.]

[3] Ver. 12.—[The *Rec.* reads: τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, but the words τοῦ αἰῶνος are rejected by all recent editors as an explanatory gloss. They are found in ℵ[3] (but rubbed out) D.[3] K. L., most cursives, a number of fathers (with an asterisk in Syriac-Phil.), but omitted in ℵ.[1] A. B. D.[1] F., good versions, most fathers.—R.]

[4] Ver. 12.—[The emendations in the latter part of this verse are required by the exegetical views adopted in the additional notes. The only variation from the rendering required by Dr. Braune's opinions is in the insertion of *hosts*. See *Exeg. Notes*.—R.]

[5] Ver. 16.—[Instead of the well-supported reading of the *Rec.* (ἐπί) ℵ. B, 10 cursives, a few fathers reads, ἐν, which is adopted by Lachmann, but rejected by nearly all more recent editors as a correction for the ambiguous ἐπί. Alford is in doubt.—The force of ἐπί is correctly given in the above emendation; comp. *Exeg. Notes*.—R.]

[6] Ver. 16.—[In B. D.[1] F., τά is omitted, rejected by Lachmann, bracketted by Alford, but "it seems more probable that the article was omitted by an oversight, than that the transcriber felt any grammatical difficulty, and sought to remedy it by insertion" (Ellicott). So Meyer, and most, with the support of ℵ. A. D.[2] K. L., and most minor authorities. On the effect of the omission on the grammatical construction, see *Exeg. Notes*.—R.]

[7] Ver. 17.—[In D.[1] F. G., some minor authorities the verb is omitted; in A. D.[3] K., a number of cursives, it is changed into δέξασθαι (Matthies), but the reading of the *Rec.* (δέξασθε) is well supported, and generally accepted. The internal grounds are strongly in favor of it; had the verb been originally wanting the corrector would probably have supplied ἀναλάβετε, while the infinitive form may be ascribed either to itacism or to the presence of an infinitive in the clause immediately preceding (so Meyer.)—R.]

[8] Ver. 18.—[The *Rec.* inserts τοῦτο after αὐτό, with D.[3] K. L., some cursives and fathers, but it is rejected as an explanatory addition by recent editors on good uncial authority, confirmed by variations which are best accounted for on the theory of its spuriousness.—*In* is more literal than *with*, indicating also the variation in prepositions.—R.]

[9] Ver. 19.—The *Rec.* reads δοθείη, but it has no uncial support, found only in a few cursives.—The emendations in this verse are necessary, as the E. V. gives a wrong connection and interpretation.—R.]

[10] Ver. 19.—[The words τοῦ εὐαγγελίου are omitted in B. F. G., and bracketted by Lachmann, but accepted by more recent editors (Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott) on the evidence of ℵ. A. D. E. K. L., good cursives and versions. —R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary: 1. Internal *strengthening*, ver. 10; 2. Necessity of *armor* on account of the enemies, vers. 11-13; 3. The *armor* itself, vers. 14-17 (*a.* the preparation, vers. 14, 15; *b.* the defensive armor, vers. 16, 17 *a;* *c.* the one offensive weapon, ver. 17 *b*); 4. The *prayer* and *intercession*, vers. 18-20 (*a.* prayer in general; *b.* intercession in general, ver. 18; *c.* intercession for the Apostle, vers. 19, 20).

Ver. 10. **Finally,** τὸ λοιπόν.—*Particula sive formula concludendi et ut ad rem magnam excitandi*, 2 Cor. xiii. 11, *formula progrediendi* (Bengel). Phil. iii. 1; iv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 1; 2 Thess. ii. 1. Luther is good: finally. Τοῦ λοιποῦ [see *Textual Note* 1] would mean: henceforth, in future (Gal. vi. 17); here it would be unintelligible.

Be strengthened in the Lord, ἐνδυναμοῦσθε ἐν κυρίῳ.—What in the active form is ascribed to the Lord, who strengthens (Phil. iv. 13; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 17), is expressed by the passive* here, without further qualification, Acts ix. 22; more closely defined in 2 Tim. ii. 1: "in the grace;" Rom. iv. 20: "in faith;" Heb. xi. 34: "out of weakness" (*ex morbo convalescere*). It cannot be middle (Piscator), nor can κυρίῳ refer to God (B-Crusius). The general qualification: in the Lord is then more closely defined: **and in the might of his strength,** καὶ ἐν τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ.—Καί is explicative here. ["This appended clause serves to explain and specify the principle in which our strength was to be sought for, and in which it dwelt" (Ellicott).—R.] On the whole phrase see *Exeg. Notes*, i. 19. This gives prominence to what comes to us from Christ (1 Cor. xii. 9): Christ's strength becomes our strength; only in Him are we strengthened.

The necessity of armor (panoply) on account of the enemies; vers. 11-13.

Ver. 11. **Put on the whole armour of God** [ἐνδύσασθε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ].—To those being strengthened in the Lord it is said: "put on;" ἐνδύσασθε has something of a paronomasia between ἐνδυναμοῦσθε and δύνασθαι. The internal strengthening must appropriate the proffered means of assistance, in order to become powerful in conflict. For this the Christian requires τὴν πανοπλίαν* τοῦ θεοῦ (here, ver. 13; Luke xi. 22). The figure of a conflict is frequently used by the Apostle (2 Cor. x. 4; 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7; Rom. vi. 13, 23; 1 Thess. v. 8; comp. Isa. lix. 16-19; Wisdom v. 17-24). The word πανοπλία refers to the entire equipment; it will not suffice to choose, or put on one or another piece of this military equipment; Ambrose: *universitas armorum;* Luther incorrectly limits it to: *Harnesch* [old English *harness*, defensive armor], both here and ver. 13. But it must also be "the panoply *of God*," *arma, quæ offeruntur, suppeditantur a Deo* (Calvin, Calovius), therefore a Divine armament; the arms should be altogether of a Divine kind, in contrast to the arms of the opponent. The emphasis rests on the whole idea: God's equipment, neither on πανοπλία alone (Meyer), nor on θεοῦ alone (Harless).† It is not a detailed and playful imitation of 1 Thess. v. 8 (De Wette), but rather an independent reference to Isa. lix. 16-19, which is used in a different way for the Judgment in (Wisdom v. 17-24). Whether a Roman or Jewish warrior was in Paul's mind is in itself an unprofitable question; the former met him constantly, the latter not.

That ye may be able to stand, πρὸς τὸ δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς στῆναι. The first verb is repeated in ver. 13 (δυνηθῆτε) and ver. 16 (δυνήσεσθε). Στῆναι πρός τινα is a military phrase, the opposite of φεύγειν, and denotes the acceptance of a conflict with him who attacks. ["To stand one's ground;" Ellicott remarks on the sense of πρός in this phrase, that it means

* ["Be strong" does not bring out this passive force; hence "be strengthened" is generally substituted by English commentators and revisers.—R.]

* [The E. V.: "whole armour," is the only possible translation of this word; "panoply" is simply the Greek word with an English termination, and is less readily understood by the ordinary reader. That both offensive weapons and defensive armor are included will appear at first glance from ver. 17.—R.]

† [Eadie, Alford and Ellicott follow Meyer, urging that the emphasis on τοῦ θεοῦ would imply some other spiritual armor, but Braune's view avoids this objection, and is preferable on account of the double antithesis: "the wiles of the devil."—R.]

adversus, with the implied notion of *hostility* ('contra'), which is otherwise less usual unless it is involved in the verb. Comp. WINER, p. 378.—R.]

Against the wiles of the devil, πρὸς τὰς μεθοδείας τοῦ διαβόλου.—LUTHER very aptly renders it: "against the crafty assaults of the devil." The plural marks both the multiplicity of the concrete cases, and the obstinacy of the repeated attack (STIER).* Craft and strength are both present in the assault, but the latter is concealed under the former, thus becoming dangerous and destructive. "The devil" is mentioned as the precise enemy, even though it be sin that is to be immediately contended against (Heb. xii. 1, 4). "The panoply of God" and "the wiles of the devil," are thus opposed to each other. The power of the latter is by no means inconsiderable and the contest is difficult, hence the next statement.

Ver. 12. **For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood** [ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα.]—"For" (ὅτι) introduces a reason for the proposition: "to stand against the wiles of the devil" is in question. The form οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη is remarkable; ἡμῖν includes with emphasis the Apostle; a proposition valid for all is treated of; ἔστιν πάλη denotes the present conflict, while πάλη (πάλλειν, to throw, to swing), the wrestling-match, *lucta* (ERASMUS), *colluctatio* (AUGUSTINE, *Vulgate*), is used in order to characterize the close, personal, struggle. Paul had in view the subject-matter and the readers, not mere rhetorical beauty. The article denotes the contest, which exists and which every one already knows. The Apostle denies the contest "against blood and flesh" because *pone homines, qui nos infestant* LATENT *spiritus* (BENGEL). Underneath and behind what is human and sinful, Satan himself is active (STIER). Paul insists on the final ground, the deepest cause of the contest, the guiding principle, the commanding general; flesh and blood is to him only the division of the army which presses forward, occasioning special danger. Comp. WINER, p. 463. AUGUSTINE: *Non est nobis colluctatio adversus carnem et sanguinem, i. e., homines, quos videtis sævire in nos. Vasa sunt, alius utitur; organa sunt, alius jungit.* We have οὐκ—ἀλλά, hence not= *non tam, non tantum—quam* (GROTIUS, STIER and others). [Most commentators now oppose the softening down of the negation (following WINER and MEYER). The word πάλη (only here) has been generally considered a change of metaphor or taken in a general sense. It undoubtedly marks the hand to hand conflict, and should therefore be taken literally. MEYER, who formerly accepted a change of metaphor, now maintains that this figure enters only in the negative clause, and that some general word is to be supplied after ἀλλά. This avoids a mixing of metaphors, but the learned author does not seem to notice that it weakens the sense just where it ought to be strongest, in the positive clause. He also takes the article as *generic*, but ALFORD suggests that ἡ πάλη refers to "the only conflict which can be described by such a word—our life and death struggle, there being but *one* such," which is better.—R.]

The contest with flesh and blood is not, however, on this account excluded. The usual order is σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα (Matt. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16), in Heb. ii. 14 we find as a various reading [probably the correct reading, as it is supported by our best uncial authorities.—R.]: αἵματος καὶ σαρκός. Since the formation of the flesh proceeds from the blood (Wisdom vii. 1, 2), reference is made here to the origin of man and his corrupt nature denoted, according to the context. The position of the two words is not accidental (MEYER). Elsewhere the phrase means human nature in itself (1 Cor. xv. 50), including what is sinful, Matt. xvi. 19; Gen. i. 16. One's own flesh and blood is also included here; it is not to be referred only to the human *persons* about one's self (BENGEL, HARLESS, MEYER, and others).

But, ἀλλά supply ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη.—**Against the principalities,** πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς.—The repetition of the preposition with each term gives prominence rhetorically to the several notions. WINER, p. 392. Ἀρχάς indicates the organization of the kingdom of the devil, denoting the chiefs and heads of the separate groups.—**Against the powers,** πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας marks the efficient, attacking powers, comp. i. 21; iii. 10.—**Against the world rulers of this darkness,** πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας του σκότους τούτου.—This term (also in the Hebrew [Rabbinical term] קוֹזְמוֹקְרָטוֹר) denotes the world-ruling power: for "the whole world lieth in darkness" (1 John v. 19; ii. 14) and Satan is "the god of this world" (2 Cor. iv. 4), "the prince of this world" (John xvi. 11; xiv. 30); his angels are under him world-rulers, whose sphere is designated by the genitive: "of this darkness." Κόσμος more closely designates the local extension and region of the dominion, τοῦ σκότους its quality as to origin and corruptness, but it is limited by τούτου, which points to something transient and bounded. On this account we should neither weaken the meaning of κοσμοκράτορες into "rulers" (HARLESS), nor is it necessary (with BENGEL, STIER [E. V.] and others) to read τοῦ αἰῶνος after τοῦ σκότους. BENGEL: *Bene quod non sunt omnitenentes: magna tamen non solum ipsius diaboli, sed etiam eorum, quibus præest, potentia est. Videntur alia esse genera malorum spirituum, quæ magis domi in arce regni tenebrarum manent, imperia, potestates, aliud hoc tertium, quod foris mundanas quasi provincias obtinet munditenentes.** The *power* is made prominent in the first two terms, and in the third the sphere; there follows next a designation which gives prominence to the character:

Against the spiritual hosts of wicked-

* [The word is generally used in a bad sense, though Diodorus Siculus uses the verb of geometrical investigations (ALFORD). EADIE renders it: "stratagems;" ALFORD: "schemes." The form μεθοδίας is found in ℵ. A. B.[1] D.[1] F. K. L., many cursives, but not generally received, as the variation is supposed to be due to *itacism* (comp. iv. 14).—R.]

* [ELLICOTT: "The dogmatical meaning is correctly explained by the Greek commentators: the evil spirits exercise dominion over the κόσμος, not in its mere material nature, but in its ethical and perhaps intellectual character and relations, the depravation of which is expressed by τοῦ σκότους τούτου." MEYER's note (mainly adopted by ELLICOTT) *in loco* is interesting and valuable.—R.]

ness.—Πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ (Vulgate: *spiritualia)* is an abstract term, the concluding antithesis of "flesh and blood," comprising all the spiritualities, which, in contrast with the kingdom of the Holy Ghost, deserve the characteristic: τῆς πονηρίας, as the spirit of revolution; to such belong moral wickedness and malice, which is directed to the destruction of others. It is incorrect to take πνευματικῷ=πνεύματα (LUTHER: with evil spirits), or collectively as *Geisterschaft* (MEYER), or to translate the phrase *spirituales nequitias* (ERASMUS). [This view, supported by Braune, is that of STIER, but it is by no means so satisfactory as that of MEYER, accepted by HODGE, EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT and others. This takes the term collectively (see WINER, p. 224, and MEYER), as implying something more than "spirits," rather the bands, hosts, armies, confraternities of spirits, best expressed by the German term: *Geisterschaft.* See ELLICOTT against the altogether untenable rendering of the E. V., as well as against the abstract meaning in general.—R.]

In heavenly places, ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.—This is to be connected grammatically with τὰ πνευματικά (*omnium doctorum opinio*, JEROME), and, as in iii. 10; i. 3, 20; ii. 6; has a local signification, designating a region in antithesis to the earthly, to what is in any manner perceptible to the sense; here, where angels are spoken of, it means the region assigned to these beings who are purely spiritual over against men, and although there are angels who have not remained in their original fellowship with God, yet there still remains to them a region corresponding to their nature, of course not in nearness to God. It does not then mean *in statu cœlesti* as a moral notion, but only as a physical one, so that it may be taken as parallel to ἀήρ, ii. 1, though it is not exactly equivalent; ἀήρ is spoken of from the stand-point of man, τὰ ἐπουράνια from the nature of angels, marking the dangerous element of the contest with these spirits and their spiritualities. Hence before all we are to reject the explanation: "for heavenly possessions" (GREEK FATHERS, CALOVIUS, MORUS and others), since the position of the words will not permit this phrase to be joined with πάλη in the beginning of the sentence, passing over ἀλλά, nor is ἐν =ὑπέρ, διά, while the signification of the phrase is uniformly local. [Comp. i. 3.] It does not designate the place of the conflict, the kingdom of heaven (MATTHIES),* nor the place, but in a symbolical sense, out into the fathomless air, in order to show that the contest is unequal *Marte iniquo* (RUECKERT), or in such a way that region and subject meet, as though a conflict was spoken of in our souls, but respecting calling and sanctification, our praying and preaching of God's grace (STIER); nor yet are we to think of the spiritual world and its affairs (B-CRUSIUS). Finally with the proper view of the connection we should neither interpolate a "formerly" (SEMLER), as though only the previous condition of the angels was denoted, nor does it suffice to accept the limitation to a locality excluded (HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, i. 455), nor is it admissible to treat the notion of heaven as an elastic one, so that these angels are still relatively in a heaven, the atmospheric one (MEYER). Nor does it at all mean a pretended stay, so that the expression is apt irony in view of the arrogation of equal dignity, power and glory with God (SCHENKEL).

[The connection with the phrase immediately preceding is accepted by nearly all recent commentators, but there is necessarily difference of opinion about the exact force of the term. ELLICOTT objects to any precise specification of locality, though referring to HOFMANN, whose view is properly rejected by MEYER. SCHENKEL's view is a pure invention. Such irony was not befitting the earnestness of Paul's discourse, and was scarcely so "apt" as SCHENKEL thinks, if no one else but himself has hitherto appreciated it. ELLICOTT aptly expresses the sense: "superna spirits of evil." The E. V. shows the reluctance to apply the word "heavenly" to evil spirits. See MEYER and EADIE for notice of other shifts. —R.]

* [EADIE adopts this view: "The celestial spots occupied by the Church; on them this combat is to be maintained. Those evil spirits have invaded the Church—and therefore believers must encounter and fight them 'in the heavenly places.'" To this view nothing in the context points, while it seems a too remote connection to join this phrase with πάλη.—R.]

Ver. 13. **Wherefore,** διὰ τοῦτο, because we have to contend against such.—**Take up the whole armour of God.**—Comp. ver. 11. Ἀναλάβετε is a technical term for taking up the arms.—**That ye may be able to withstand.**—Instead of πρός (ver. 11) we here have ἵνα; the goal is denoted there, the purpose here; ἀντιστῆναι is somewhat livelier, indicating the attacks of the spirit, whom he in spirit sees making an assault. — **In the evil day,** ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πονηρᾷ. — At all events this means a particular day, immediately impending, but quite as certainly is it not the same for every one, since a common contest is not implied, not a battle, but a πάλη, "wrestling," in which the victory is decisive for "the day of redemption." Therefore the decisive, imminent day of conflict for each one is marked. BENGEL: *bellum est perpetuum; pugna alio die minus fervet; dies malus vel ingruente morte, vel in vita; longior, brevior, in se ipso sæpe varius.* [So HODGE, EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT.] See *Doctr. Notes.* It is neither the day of death (SCHMID), still less the day of Judgment (JEROME), nor in general every day of conflict with its calamity (THEODORET, PELAGIUS, HARLESS and others), [nor the *present life* with the accompanying thought of brevity, CHRYSOSTOM, ŒCUMENIUS, THEOPHYLACT,] nor the particular common day [of the last great Satanic outbreak] before the Second Advent (KOPPE, MEYER, STIER and others), nor is it merely the evil hours (LUTHER).

And having accomplished all, to stand [καὶ ἅπαντα κατεργασάμενοι στῆναι]. —To ἀντιστῆναι, referring to the conflict, the Apostle appends (καί) στῆναι, which designates the victorious keeping the field on the place of contest; it is the opposite of fleeing, yielding, being thrown down. Ἅπαντα κατεργασάμενοι, placed first, denotes a performing, effecting, the object of which is more fully designated with ἅπαντα, more comprehensible than πάντα, *omnia operati* (JEROME), well executing all (LUTHER); comp. Rom. vii. 13; Phil. ii. 12.

The Apostle here treats of the doing of the Divine will in all directions and relations, the ethical activity and efficiency of the Christian, which cuts its way through all assaults and conflicts from the side of the demons, without being led astray or weakened. It is neither=παρασκευασάμενοι, *omnibus rebus probe comparatis ad pugnam* (BENGEL and others), nor=*debellare, phrasis bellica* (GREEK FATHERS, GROTIUS, KOPPE, HARLESS and others), nor does it refer to the conflict itself (MEYER and others), nor yet is it: *in omnibus perfecti* (*Vulgate*).

[The participle is never used by Paul in the sense of "having overcome;" it is therefore best to accept the usual meaning: "having accomplished," especially as we might expect a masculine object instead of the neuter ἅπαντα, were the former sense intended. At the same time the view of BENGEL is evidently too restricted for the extended meaning of both participle and object. There remains still another question respecting the scope of the clause. Braune follows LUTHER in referring the infinitive to keeping the field; in that case the participle necessarily refers to all the antecedent action. EADIE, ALFORD, and ELLICOTT however apply the term to standing firm until the end of the combat, which seems preferable in view of the continued reference in context to the conflict itself. The participle, with its object, then means: having done all that the exigencies of the conflict require, "being fully equipped and having bravely fought."—R.]

The ARMOR *itself;* vers. 14-17. *a. The preparation;* vers. 14, 15. *b. The defensive armor;* vers. 16, 17 a. *c. The one offensive weapon;* ver. 17 b.

Ver. 14. **Stand therefore,** στῆτε οὖν, in the conflict, in order after the conflict to stand as victor. [MEYER, ELLICOTT: "stand ready for the fight;" ALFORD: "whether 'ready for the fight' or 'in the fight' matters very little: all the aoristic participles are in time antecedent to the στῆτε—and the fight ever at hand."—R.]—**Having girt your loins about with truth,** περιζωσάμενοι τὴν ὀσφὺν ὑμῶν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.—Being girded about their loins, they have on the girdle, or waist-belt (ζωστήρ, ζώνη), which covers the groin and the stomach below the breastplate, the most vulnerable part of the body, the region of the hips and loins; this is the first and a very important piece (Isa. v. 27; xi. 5; Luke xii. 35; 1 Pet. i. 13). [Meyer: "An ungirded soldier would be a contradiction in terms." The girdle kept the armor in place, formed in itself a part of the cuirass, and was also used to support the sword. The latter notion ALFORD regards as confusing here, but it hardly seems so, since the sword was *objective* truth.—R.]—Ἐν ἀληθείᾳ that with which the loins are enveloped, like καίειν ἐν πυρί, καλύπτειν ἐν ἱματίῳ (WINER, p. 363*); here it means the objective truth revealed in the word, which is appropriated. *Veritas adstringit hominem, mendaciorum magna est laxitas* (GROTIUS). On this account we should neither exclude the former (HARLESS, MEYER), nor understand merely the moral truth of willing (HARLESS) or the agreement of knowledge with the objective truth given in the gospel (MEYER), or sincerity (CALVIN and others), or apply this to ornament (HARLESS). ["Truth" here is *subjective* truth, since the article is wanting and the objective truth is mentioned in ver. 17. Still it is based on the faith and standing of a Christian (ALFORD): "the assured conviction that you believe" (EADIE). It should be noticed that faith (by implication) enters here and in the mention of the sword, as well as explicitly in the figure of the shield.—R.]

And having put on the breastplate of righteousness [καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης].—Here καί adjoins another piece. Ἐνδυσάμενοι* means putting on like a part of the clothes. Τὸν θώρακα is added by the Apostle without a designation of the part of the body (στῆθος) which it covers because that is self-evident. The genitive (τῆς δικαιοσύνης) is appositional; here it means the righteousness of faith and of life, justification and sanctification before God and men (Rom. vi. 4, 13). *In pectore sedes est conscientiæ, quæ munitur justitia. Hostis per omnia ipsi contraria vincitur* (BENGEL). MEYER finds here the *ethical* rectitude, as in the previous clause the *intellectual*, which is only so far correct, that here we should find an ethical reference, there an intellectual one, as in v. 9; Isa. xi. 5. HARLESS: The righteousness of faith, with which alone one does not stand on the place of conflict, which also passes over into the life. [So ALFORD: "The purity and uprightness of Christian character which is the result of the work of the Spirit of Christ; the inwrought righteousness, not merely the imputed righteousness." The latter reference is defended by EADIE and HODGE; the former pressing the article in support of it, the latter urging that no moral virtue forms part of the armor and then saying that the subjective sense of righteousness was included already in the word "truth." The wider reference is preferable, for the more restricted one belongs to a view of the word δικαιοσύνη, which is too forensic, sundering in twain an indivisible truth. For the correct meaning of the word, see *Romans*, pp. 74, 75, 78, etc.—R.]

Ver. 15. **Having shod your feet,** καὶ ὑποδησάμενοι τοὺς πόδας.—This adds the third piece, and the terms are again significant. Here we must think of the war-sandals, προκνημῖδας, *ocreæ militares*†, which give firm footing and gait.—**With the preparedness of the gospel of peace** [ἐν ἑτοιμασίᾳ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς εἰρήνης].—That in (ἐν) which the feet stand, is for the warrior of Christ ἑτοιμασίᾳ, readiness, *promptitudo animi*, internal and external, the ready courage and preparedness for conflict, *firmitas et constantia*, which the gospel gives; hence τοῦ εὐαγγελίου is *auctoris*, the contents and pledge of which is set

* [MEYER, ELLICOTT and others take the preposition as instrumental, but ALFORD is more exact: "not instrumental, but *local*; the girt person is within, surrounded by the girdle; but this is necessarily expressed in English by '*with*.'"—R.]

* [The aorist participles are not used for presents (HOLZHAUSEN), but with propriety; "the different acts specified by the participles were all completed before the soldier took up his position" (ELLICOTT).—R.]

† [The Roman *caligæ* were probably in the Apostle's mind; sandals with soles thickly studded with nails.—R.]

forth by τῆς εἰρήνης chiefly with God, (Rom. v. 1; viii. 31, 38 f.), then in one's self and peaceableness toward men as such.* The Christian fights in peace for the sake of peace, *viz.* the eternal one. That is an *oxymoron* (SCHENKEL): the gospel of peace instils readiness for conflict. We should not then, because *pedum sæpe* (Rom. x. 15; iii. 16 *sqq.;* Luke i. 79) *conjuncta mentio cum evangelis et cum pace* (BENGEL), allow ourselves, contrary to the context to think of the proclamation of the gospel (LUTHER: ready to carry on the gospel, HARLESS and others). [So CHRYSOSTOM and now CONYBEARE, but the Apostle was addressing the whole church as engaged in an individual conflict, mainly defensive too.—R.] Notwithstanding the frequent use of ἑτοιμασία to translate the Hebrew מָכוֹן (LXX. Ezra ii. 68; iii. 3; Ps. lxxxix. 15; Dan. xi. 20, 21), it is not to be rendered as=*fundamentum* (BENGEL and BLEEK and others), although what is positive is not to be excluded. Εἰρήνη is neither to be limited to peace with God (HARLESS, MEYER and others), nor referred to peace between Gentile and Gentile (MICHAELIS). ERASMUS is irrelevant: *evangelium—nontumultu, sed tolerantia tranquillitateque defenditur.*

The *defensive* armor; vers. 16, 17a.

Ver. 16. **In addition to all,** ἐπὶ πᾶσιν (WINER, p. 367), as in Luke iii. 20: "Added this above all;" xvi. 26. ERASMUS: *super omnia,* for a protection over all. Incorrect: before all things (LUTHER). [MEYER, HODGE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT agree with Braune (as does EADIE, who formerly defended the local sense) in taking the preposition as=in addition to, rejecting the local (Bengel and others) and ethical references (E. V.). If ἐν be accepted as the correct reading (see *Textual Note* 5) the meaning would be: in all things, *i. e.,* on all occasions.—**Having taken up,** ἀναλαβόντες, aptly chosen here:† **the shield of faith.**—Τὸν θυρεόν (from θύρα, originally that which closes an entrance) is chosen by the Apostle because he has in mind the *scutum,* which was four feet long and two and a half broad, צִנָּה (Ps. xxxv. 2; Ezek. xxiii. 24, LXX.) and not ἀσπίς, *clypeus,* מָגֵן, the smaller, round shield. The concern is that the whole person be covered, as indeed faith (τῆς πίστεως, genitive of apposition as in vers. 14, 17) entirely covers and defends the Christian: as God's gift effecting salvation (ii. 8) [MEYER: *fides salvifica*], bringing about forgiveness of sins in the past (i. 7), affording for every moment access to God (iii. 12), assuring in advance of eternal life, by securing to us the gift of the Holy Ghost (i. 13, 14), rendering holy and without blame (i. 4). Comp. Rom. viii. 14-16, 31-39. Man's own holiness is not a shield for him, as in Wisdom, v. 20; God's holiness is his shield; God Himself is our shield (Gen. xv. 1; Ps. xviii. 31; Prov. xxx. 5; 1 Pet. v. 9; 1 John v. 4). It is faith, entirely and constantly giving itself up to God in Christ, on the part of a child and heir, hence not the faith of miracles, nor justifying faith alone (SCHENKEL).

Wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the evil one.—Thus the Apostle describes the protection of faith against dangerous attacks. Ἐν ᾧ is *on* which, not with which (LUTHER and others). [It means either, lighting *on* it and being quenched *in* it, or "as protected by and under cover of which" (ELLICOTT). The former is perhaps preferable. —R.] The figure and the reality are here so much complicated in each other, that we should not think of a shield with wet hides (OLSHAUSEN), but of faith on which the destructive fire from Satan is extinguished, without causing damage. The future (δυνήσεσθε) refers to the impending conflict.* In this are thrown τὰ βέλη τοῦ πονηροῦ τὰ πεπυρωμένα; these are *malleoli* (darts), *falaricæ* (javelins), *tela ignita* (made of reeds, with tow and pitch), which are ignited and then hurled (Ps. vii. 14; LIVY, xxi. 8). The evil one, *i. e.,* Satan† (Matt. v. 37; xiii. 19, 38; John xvii. 15; 2 Thess. iii. 3) throws temptations of many kinds; hence πάντα comes first and τὰ πεπυρωμένα is placed last for emphasis (WINER, p. 127)‡. Certainly we are to understand in part dangerous and corrupting words and speeches which come to one's ears, impart thoughts cast into the heart, the fire of passions, etc. In the σβῆσαι the figure is simply exceeded by the reality. Of course we need not think of poisoned darts (RUECKERT and others), which are not burning, but inflict burning wounds. Yet it cannot be said that we should not think of burning desires (CHRYSOSTOM), because these are present *within* man (SCHENKEL); faith is an affair of the heart, and in the heart the conflict of redemption is fought and won; besides fire and iron could scarcely be two deadly elements, which aptly illustrate the attacks of Satan. [SCHENKEL].

Ver. 17. **And take** [or receive] **the helmet of salvation** [καὶ τὴν περικεφαλαίαν τοῦ σωτηρίου δέξασθε.—This advance is natural. In accordance with the genius of the Greek language a translation is made to the finite construction; it is not simply Paul's lively method (MEYER), but that of the language. The genitive, τοῦ σωτηρίου, is one of apposition, as in vers. 14, 16.] The word is entirely general as in Luke ii. 30; iii. 6; Acts xxviii. 28 (from Isa. lix. 17, LXX. with a reference to the name of Jesus, in which the battle is fought and won,

* [This view of the passage is now generally accepted (MEYER, ALFORD and many others). On the word ἑτοιμασία, used principally in the LXX. and ecclesiastical writers (the classical form was ἑτοιμότης), see MEYER and ALFORD *in loco.* —R.]

† [EADIE: "The pieces of armor already mentioned being fitted on to the body and fastened to it, each by appropriate mechanism, have each its characteristic verb—but shield, helmet and sword need no such special fastening, for they are simply taken up or assumed, and therefore they are joined to the one general participle, ἀναλαβόντες, and the verb δέξασθε."—R.]

* [Not, however, as MEYER thinks, to the last great future fight. ALFORD thinks the future implies the certainty that the shield of faith will thus quench. ELLICOTT regards it as only "a conditioned present."—R.]

† [Should the article be omitted (see *Textual Note* 6) the participle would be a tertiary predicate; "fire-tipt as they are" (ELLICOTT), "when inflamed, even in their utmost malice and fiery power" (ALFORD).—R.]

‡ [ELLICOTT: "Not 'evil,' τὸ πονηρόν, but in accordance with the individualizing and *personal* nature of the conflict which the context so forcibly depicts—the Devil." ALFORD: "The conflict being personal, the adversary must be, not an abstract principle, but a concrete person."—R.]

whom faith appropriates) and is used for *σωτηρία*. The salvation of the Messianic kingdom is represented as a helmet, covering the head. For the warrior does not hide himself behind his shield, but looks over it into the face of his opponent.—Δ έ ξ α σ θ ε, *accipite oblatam a domino. Salute erigitur caput et munitur.* 1 Thess. v. 8; Psa. iii. 3, 4 (BENGEL). Salvation is the subject of the faith, in which the salvation is apprehended (HARLESS). [HODGE: "That which adorns and protects the Christian, which enables him to hold up his head with confidence and joy, is the fact that he is saved." The German has an alliteration here: *Den Helm des Heils nehmt*, which Wickliffe gives in the Old English of his version: "the helme of helthe."—R.]

The *one offensive* weapon; ver. 17 b.

And the sword of the Spirit, *κ α ὶ τ ὴ ν μ ά χ α ι ρ α ν τ ο ῦ π ν ε ύ μ α τ ο ς*.—There is no mention, in addition, as in 1 Sam. xvii. 47; of the "spear," or of the "bow" (Gen. xlviii. 22; Josh. xxiv. 12; Psa. xliv. 7). The Christian has only to contend *cominus*, personally, not *eminus*. The sword is "of the Spirit;" *τ ο ῦ π ν ε ύ μ α τ ο ς* is a genitive *auctoris:* He gives it, makes it. It cannot be appositional (HARLESS and others), as before, since the apposition follows in the relative clause.*

Which is the word of God.—Ὅ ἐ σ τ ι which is neuter by attraction of *ῥ ῆ μ α θ ε ο ῦ*, relates to *μάχαιραν*, and is not to be construed with *πνεύματος* (OLSHAUSEN), for the Holy Ghost is not the Word of God; the latter is the product, the former is the Producer of what is in the word of God. *Concinne subsequitur mentio Spiritus, adeoque coll. ver.* 13 *habetur mentio s. trinitatis* (BENGEL). The Holy Ghost is meant, in antithesis, both to the letter and to the flesh, hence not the human spirit (MORUS), which in itself is also *σάρξ*. "The Word of God" is not to be limited to commandments (FLATT), or threatening against the enemies of the kingdom (KOPPE).

This completes the equipment. Two things are to be maintained: 1. The difference of the arms and the ethical or supersensuous realities set forth in them should not be arbitrarily weakened. It should not be said: *universa potius armorum notio tenenda est.* Nor can a proof of this be deduced from 1 Thess. v. 8, where we read: "the breastplate of faith and love, and for an helmet the hope of salvation." From a different stand-point there can be afforded a partially different point of view. 2. The figures are not to be pressed beyond measure and the lively objective metaphor of the Apostle to be dissected in arbitrary subjectivity to practical use.†

The prayer and the intercession; vers. 18–20. (*a.*) *Prayer in general,* ver. 18 *a.* (*b.*) *Intercession in general,* ver. 18 *b.* (*c.*) *Intercession for the Apostle,* vers. 19, 20.

Ver. 18. **With all prayer and supplication praying.**—[The connection of this verse is with *στῆτε* (ver. 15), not with *δέξασθε*, which is a subordinate thought referring to a definite act, hence inconsistent with the "all," "always" of this verse (MEYER). MEYER is scarcely justifiable in disconnecting *δ ι ὰ π ά σ η ς π ρ ο σ ε υ χ ῆ ς κ α ὶ δ ε ή σ ε ω ς* from *π ρ ο σ ε υ χ ό μ ε ν ο ι* on the ground of tautology and logical difficulty. Each phrase expresses a proper qualification of the participle, and to pray always with every form of prayer involves no contradiction. HODGE seems to have been led into MEYER's view. CONYBEARE improperly takes the participle as an imperative and begins a new paragraph with this verse.—R.]

The participle (*π ρ ο σ ε υ χ ό μ ε ν ο ι*) is closely connected with the summons to the conflict and the putting on of the armor. The summons to prayer did not appear independently. Prayer is rather to be regarded as attending the taking up of the weapons and the conflict, as the present strongly indicates. The phrase: *δ ι ὰ π ά σ η ς π ρ ο σ ε υ χ ῆ ς κ α ὶ δ ε ή σ ε ω ς*, placed first, only requires, that prayer should not be neglected and that constant prayer of every form be earnestly offered up. The first term means prayer in general, the second the special request. [So HARLESS, MEYER, FRITZSCHE, TRENCH (*Syn.* II., § 1), ELLICOTT, ALFORD and most recent commentators.—R.] The opinion [GROTIUS] is untenable, that the former refers to the bestowment of a blessing, the latter to the averting of an evil (Jas. v. 16, 17).

At all times in the Spirit.—Ἐ ν π α ν τ ὶ κ α ι ρ ῷ gives prominence to the prayer as persevering, despite all change of relations and circumstances, at every opportunity, *ἐ ν π ν ε ύ μ α τ ι* to prayer, as fervent and Christian occurring in the impulse of the Holy Ghost.* BENGEL: *Quoties cunque oratis, orate in Spiritu, quippe qui nullo tempore excluditur.*

Intercession in general. **And watching thereunto in all perseverance and supplication for all the saints.**—With reference to the already described prayer (*εἰς αὐτό*) there should also enter (*καί*), "watching" (*ἀ γ ρ υ π ν ο ῦ ν τ ε ς*, from *ἄϋπνος*, Mark xiii. 33; Luke xxi. 36), which is elsewhere also joined with prayer (Matt. xxvi. 41; Mark xiv. 38; Col. iv. 2). [ALFORD: "continual habits of prayer cannot be kept up without watchfulness to that very end."—R.] This should take place: "in all perseverance and supplication for all the saints." The feeling of fellowship in the conflict finds its immediate expression in the supplication for all the fellow-combatants, whose standing fast is strength and

* ["Still less probably is it a genitive of *quality*, ἡ μάχαιρα πνευματικά (CHRYSOSTOM), or a simple genitive of *possession* in reference to the τιμωρητικὴ ἐνέργεια (Lever. ap. Cram. *Cat.*) of the Spirit, both of which seem to be at variance with the general tenor of the passage, which represents the '*armatura*' as furnished to us by God. Thus then it is from the Spirit that we receive the sword, that sword being the Word of God, the Gospel (ver. 15), which is the δύναμις θεοῦ (Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 18) to every one who believeth; comp. Heb. iv. 12" (ELLICOTT).—R.]

† [EADIE mentions among the works which are open to this objection: GURNALL, *Christian in complete armour*, Glasgow, 1763; AINSWORTH, *Tactica Sacra*, 1657; LYDIUS, *Syntagma de re militari*, ed Van Til, 1698, Dort.—The best practical commentary on this section is undoubtedly to be found in BUNYAN's *Pilgrim's Progress*, especially the armory in the "Interpreter's house," and the combat with Apollyon in "the valley of humiliation."—On the arms, comp. SMITH's *Bible Dictionary*, Arms.—R.]

* ["The Holy Spirit *in* whose blessed and indwelling influence, and by whose merciful aid, we are enabled to pray (Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6), yea, and who Himself intercedes for us (Rom. viii. 26)." So ELLICOTT, who analyzes the clause thus: "With all prayer and supplication" denotes the earnest, because varied character of the prayer; "at all times" the constancy of it, thus showing that there is no tautology as MEYER asserts and HODGE implies.—R.]

assistance to their neighbor. The Christian should have a clear view about him, to the companions in conflict at other positions, in other places, and besides continue constant in such supplication. ["Perseverance and supplication" here amounts to "persevering supplication," though it is not a grammatical Hendiadys, since the order would be inverted in that case. ELLICOTT says it is "a virtual or what might be termed a contextual ἓν διὰ δυοῖν." EADIE: "In praying for themselves they were uniformly to blend petitions for all the saints."—R.] How much depends on this is exemplified in what follows.

Intercession for the Apostle, vers. 19, 20. Ver. 19. **And for me [or on my behalf]**, *καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ*.—[Καί brings into prominence a particular instance; WINER, p. 407.—R.] On the change of prepositions (see *Exeg. Notes* on chap. v. 2) it may be remarked: As regards the saints the figure of encirclement by attacking foes is the one, hence *περί*, but in the case of the Apostle in prison, that of a fallen combatant, hence *ὑπέρ*. Or the former is=on account of, *propter*, the latter=for, *pro* (1 Pet. iii. 18), making known a stronger personal interest.*

That utterance may be given to me.—Ἵνα μοι δοθῇ, that there may be given me from the Lord as His gift.† *Non nitebatur Paulus habitu suo* (BENGEL). But what? Utterance, **in the opening of my mouth**, *λόγος ἐν ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόματός μου*.—This is one conception: *λόγος* without the article, indefinite, is more qualified by the prepositional phrase. Ἄνοιξις τοῦ στόματος is a pregnant expression (Matth. v. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 11), signifying joyful courage, streaming fulness, as well as granted freedom and fit opportunity (STIER). It is an emphatic designation of the inworking of God upon him who should speak in His name (HARLESS). Comp. Exod. iv. 12; Psa. li. 17; Isa. li. 66; Ezek. iii. 27; xxix. 31; xxxii. 22; Matth. x. 19; Luke xxi. 15. CHRYSOSTOM: *ἡ ἅλυσις ἐπίκειται τὴν παῤῥησίαν ἐπιστομίζουσα, ἀλλ' ἡ εὐχὴ ἡ ὑμετέρα ἀνοίγει μου τὸ στόμα, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ παῤῥησιάσωμαι.* CALOVIUS: *Petit sibi sermonem dari, non catenas solvi; petit apertionem oris, non vinculorum; petit sermonis παῤῥησίαν in ipsis vinculis, non liberationem ab iisdem.* A word thus uttered in the opening of the mouth effected by God is God's word. He therefore wishes a word, not for himself in his heart, but a word in his mouth for others, in furtherance of the conflict which tends to peace. This differs then from Col. iv. 2, where external opportunity is in question, while here the internal life of the Apostle is treated of. Accordingly it is incorrect to render: *ut aperiam os meum* (BEZA [E. V.] and others); in that case *εἰς* would occur instead of *ἐν*. So too: when I speak or open my mouth (MEYER and others) [so substantially EADIE, ELLICOTT, ALFORD and HODGE]; it is not merely a graphic and solemn expression, that would be too flat. Nor is an improvisation referred to (ŒCUMENIUS), or an internal moral quality of Paul, the frankness=*ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ* (CALVIN, KOPPE [BLEEK, SCHENKEL] and others), or *occasione data* (GROTIUS and others), nor is it to be joined with what follows. [The connection with what precedes (not, as in the E. V., with what follows) is now generally accepted. "The opening of the mouth" most naturally refers neither to the quality nor to the source of the discourse, but to the simple act or fact of speaking, so that the view of MEYER is on the whole preferable. As the phrase occurs here in the purport of a prayer, it *may* refer to an act of God in opening the mouth, as Braune claims, but in that case another form would have made the sense much clearer.—R.]

In boldness to make known the mystery of the gospel ["So that with boldness I may make known," *etc*].—This expresses that for which he wishes that to him "utterance may be given," "in the opening of my mouth." He would gladly "make known," and this was permitted to him in Cesarea (Acts xxiv. 23) and in Rome (Acts xxviii. 30, 31; 2 Tim. i. 16) in spite of his bonds. But he wishes to do it *ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ* (iii. 12), hence the phrase stands emphatically in advance. What he will gladly make known is the "mystery" (i. 9; iii. 9), which is the substance "of the gospel." [ELLICOTT takes it as a genitive *subjecti*, "the mystery which the gospel has, involves."—R.]

Ver. 20. **For which** [**or in behalf of which** (ELLICOTT: "*in commodum cujus*, to preach which"); see below on the exact reference.—R.]

I am an ambassador.—He thus expresses the reason why he would so gladly stand up and labor for the gospel [not merely why he was in bonds.—R.] As Christ's ambassador he holds that office for all nations, and for the gospel; hence *ὑπὲρ οὗ*, not *ὅν*. Πρεσβεύω is: I am an ambassador (2 Cor. v. 20) and that too **in bonds**, *ἐν ἁλύσει*.—What a contrast: to be an ambassador in a chain! BENGEL: *Paradoxon; mundus habet legatos splendidos.* WETSTEIN: *Alias legati jure gentium sancti et inviolabiles, in vinculis haberi non poterant.* The verb does not however indicate that he was accredited to the Roman court (MICHAELIS), nor does the noun in the singular refer to the single chain with which he was bound to a soldier, to the *custodia militaris* (BAUMGARTEN and others).* GROTIUS is incorrect: *nunc quoque non desino legationem*, for we do not read: *καὶ ἐν ἁλύσει πρεσβεύω*. Nor is it=*πρεσβεύων ἐν ἁλύσει εἰμί* (RUECKERT). Finally *οὗ* does not refer to *μυστήριον* or to *τὸ ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ γνωρίσαι*. [EADIE refers it to the whole preceding clause, but this is indistinct; MEYER, ELLICOTT and ALFORD (apparently most correctly) refer it to "the mystery of the gospel," since this was the object of *γνωρίσαι*, and what he should make known would naturally

* [MEYER, ELLICOTT and others attach little or no importance to the change of preposition here, but HARLESS, EADIE, ALFORD and others are not satisfied with the explanation that the change was occasioned by mere desire for variety. That is unlike Paul. To mark the variation in English, ALFORD renders: "*concerning* all the saints and *for* me." The *Revision* by Four Anglican clergymen gives: "for all the saints and on my behalf." ELLICOTT in his translation gives: and *in particular* for me, but this is a paraphrase of the specializing *καί*.—R.]

† [The reading of the *Rec.* (*δοθείη*), on which see *Textual Note* 9, would give the purpose a more subjective reference, and represent the feeling of a more dependent reality (ELLICOTT).—R.]

* [The allusion is probable, but as the singular is frequently used in a collective sense, and this word is employed by Paul only in the singular, we cannot certainly infer that there is such an allusion here.—R.]

be that for which he was an ambassador in bonds. R—.]

That therein I may speak boldly, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ παῤῥησιάσωμαι.—Ἵνα introduces an end, and the final one: "that therein I may speak boldly." ["His being thus a captive ambassador, was all the more reason why they should pray earnestly that he might have boldness" (ALFORD). On the grammatical connection see the concluding note.—R.] The gospel is the immediate task of the free discourse. in this, however, there is also a message of Divine power, is the source and ground of the boldness. When there is first vouchsafed to him "an utterance in the opening of his mouth," then also does he obtain "boldness" in the gospel, and that too: **as I ought to speak,** ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι.—The emphasis rests on the ὡς as in Luke xii. 11 (STIER). Much depends on *how* it is done, hence "as I ought to speak." He must indeed testify; that is his "necessity" (1 Cor. ix. 16); but to him belongs also, beyond the εὐαγγελίσασθαι, the manner worthy of the ambassador of Christ. This defines the fulfilling of his task, his duty. Comp. Col. iv. 4; 1 Thess. ii. 2. Accordingly ἵνα in this verse is not co-ordinate with the first ἵνα in ver. 19 (MEYER, BLEEK and others), since this is the final end of the Church's supplication, to be attained through the fulfilment of the first ἵνα; nor is it dependent on πρεσβεύω (BENGEL), which is inconceivable.

[EADIE, ALFORD, HODGE and ELLICOTT, all agree with MEYER, in taking this ἵνα as co-ordinate with that in ver. 19, thus setting forth a second purpose of the watching and the supplication for the Apostle. This involves no tautology, as HARLESS supposes, since the reference here is to a conditioned boldness, and "therein" indicates not the source or ground, but the sphere of the boldness: "in the matter of, in dealing with the mystery of the gospel;" God is the source. Such a co-ordinate ἵνα occurs in Rom. vii. 13; Gal. iii. 14; 2 Cor. ix 3. It is true as Braune suggests, that this design is accomplished only through the fulfilment of the previous purpose (ver. 19), but grammatically the clause must be either co-ordinate or subordinate (the view of BENGEL being altogether untenable); if the latter, then it would express the purpose, not of the whole previous context, the supplication and consequent utterance, but simply of the gift of utterance, a view which Braune himself does not accept. We prefer therefore the other construction as more grammatical and not militating against the special point our author would bring out. For convenience a paraphrase of vers. 18–20 is appended: In this conflict therefore stand, not only armed thus, but *with all* (every form of) *prayer and supplication, praying at all times* (perseveringly and under all circumstances) *in the* (Holy) *Spirit, and watching thereunto* (in respect to this varied and constant prayer) *in all perseverance and supplication* (abiding even as you pray in persevering supplication) *for all the saints; and* (in particular) *on behalf of me, that to me may be given* (from God) *utterance, in the opening of my mouth* (when I am called upon to speak), *so that with boldness I may make known the mystery of the gospel* (whose contents are the gospel), *in behalf of which* (gospel mystery) *I am an ambassador in bonds* (a chained ambassador); (praying for me too in view of my office and condition) *that therein* (in the matter of the gospel mystery) *I may speak boldly, as I ought* (as becomes my office) *to speak.*—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The kingdom of Satan.* There is an organized *kingdom of evil* (HAHN, *Theologie des N. T.*, I. p. 347), opposing the kingdom and people of God. In this there is a head, διάβολος (ver. 11; ii. 2; iv. 27); there are different groups, ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι (ver. 12; iii. 10; comp. i. 21), superior and inferior, with dominion over the world, κοσμοκράτορες. The *nature* of the prince and his dependents is pneumatic (ver. 12: τὰ πνευματικά) and super-terrestrial, ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (ver. 12); thus prominence is given to their might over against men; they are super-terrestrial, with angelic power. Their character, however, is marked by the terms "wickedness" (ver. 12: τῆς πονηρίας), "darkness" (τοῦ σκότους, ver. 12) and "the evil one" (ver. 16); at his service are multifarious wiles (ver. 11: αἱ μεθοδεῖαι), which perceive the necessities and weakness of the object to be assaulted in all relations, preparing the attacks accordingly. [EADIE: "To rouse up the Christian soldiery, the Apostle brings out into bold relief the terrible foes which they are summoned to encounter. As to their position, they are no subalterns, but foes of mighty rank, the nobility and chieftains of the spirit-world; as to their office, their domain is 'this darkness' in which they exercise imperial sway; as to their essence, they are not encumbered with an animal frame, but are 'spirits;' and as to their character, they are 'evil'—their appetite for evil only exceeds their capacity for producing it."—R.]

2. *The contest* in its essence is a single-handed struggle in wrestling (ver. 12: ἀλλά, sc. ἐστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη), in which each for himself is attacked. The danger lies in the power and character of the enemy and of his wiles (see 1), in which he does not himself openly appear; he casts βέλη, many (πάντα) and fiery ones (ver 16), as also in the end of the vanquished one. who belongs to "darkness" (ver. 12) as a result of the "deceit" (iv. 14). The means for assault and conflict are afforded to the Evil one by the world, which is at his disposal, and by "flesh and blood" (ver. 12), which war against the soul and become allies in the service of Satan, against whom the contest really is waged, standing behind these as he does with his stratagems and artifices. What is natural and created is not the precise antagonist against whom we must contend. The Apostle sketches the conflict as a present one (ἐστιν, ver. 12), concerning every member of the church, the Apostle and every Christian, having however its history, its various stages up to the day of decision ("in the evil day," ver. 13) for which we must be prepared by opposition from the very start, being practiced in the turns and twists of the contest. Hence we are to understand the temptations and antagonisms, which meet every Christian in this world, which are spared to no period of the Church. They *appear* as contests with flesh and blood. with the world and its influence through its posses-

sions, pleasures and honors, but back of this there stands really and in truth the kingdom of darkness.* At certain times and hours they are intensified into specially decisive conflict. The evil day may be either the most fierce persecution and bitter sorrow, or quite as readily prosperity and undisturbed earthly happiness, in which some may fall even deeper and the Church itself be corrupted into unfaithfulness. This is true in particular for every Christian and his Christian life, and also in general for the Christian Church in its groups and its course of development. As the power of the Evil one is a cosmical one, and not merely a human one, humanly individualized, so the conflict itself is a cosmical one also, and not merely an individual one.

3. *The panoply.* In such a conflict the Christian needs an *equipment*, given by God and covering the whole man (*ἡ πανοπλία τοῦ θεοῦ*, vers. 11, 13). Man of himself, in his own power and strength, is unable to withstand the attacks; he has assailable and vulnerable points, which he must protect against the assaults of the Evil One, but which he alone cannot protect; only with the Lord Christ and in His power can he do it, even though he stands isolated; without God in Christ never!—*The separate pieces* of this armor (vers. 14-17) are: truth, righteousness, zealous but not passionate witness, faith, which concerns the whole personality, hope, which exalts, and God's Word. The first three pieces betoken the garments, the next two the defensive armor, the last the one only weapon of offence and attack adapted only for single-handed and close combat, which belongs to the Christian warrior, to the Christian assailed by the Evil One and yet courageous and assured of victory. No one piece can be undervalued or neglected: each one requires the other; they together form one whole.—The putting on of this armor presupposes a being strengthened, points to an internal and vital appropriation, and requires faithful fulfilment of duty (*ἅπαντα κατεργασάμενοι*, ver. 13). Neither a knowledge which is a matter either of the memory merely or of the reflecting understanding, nor an external mechanical skill in the handling of these spiritual pieces of armor, will suffice for the conflict and the victory. Even the standing ready for the combat is not enough; there must be a solicitous regard as to what is to be done, and performance of the immediate task in peaceable walk. But above all must we cling to the Lord, in order to become inwardly strengthened by Him.—Hence Paul adjoins to the lively sketch of the panoply in close connection soberly without a figure.

* [HODGE remarks respecting the conflict: "It is one also in which great mistakes are often committed and serious loss incurred from ignorance of its nature, and of the appropriate means for carrying it on. Men are apt to regard it as a mere moral conflict between reason and conscience on the one side, and evil passions on the other. They therefore rely on their own strength and upon the resources of nature for success. Against these mistakes the Apostle warns his readers. He teaches that everything pertaining to it is supernatural. The source of strength is not in nature. The conflict is not between the good and bad principles of our nature. He shows that we belong to a spiritual as well as to a natural world, and are engaged in a combat in which the higher powers of the universe are involved; and that this conflict, on the issue of which our salvation depends, is not to be carried on with straws picked up by the wayside. As we have superhuman enemies to contend with, we need not only superhuman strength, but Divine armor and arms. The weapons of our warfare are not natural, but Divine."—R.]

4. *Praying and watching* (ver. 18), just as the Lord enjoined it and practiced it in the struggle in the garden of Gethsemane (Matth. xxvi. 36-46); God's Word to and for us teaches and leads us to open our hearts before Him in our word to Him. There must be at length intercourse between Him and our souls, in order to strengthen us more and more and enable us to do our duty. In *prayerful* intercourse, that grows ever more fervent, free, joyous and constant, we obtain God's power. But we must with *true* open look see about and within ourselves, so that our weakness, the motions of the flesh, the surrounding agitation, the state of the times, the assaults of the enemy, God's will and word, do not escape us.

5. We must advance to *intercession* for all saints and for the special warriors of the present. The Christian stands in single-handed combat, but is not isolated; the fall of one may involve the fall of another, perhaps of many. The victory of one preserves many from a fall. The conflict of the Christian is a common concern, the cause of the Church. That is an evidence of watching, when in the supplication for all special thought is given to those who are fighting in the van and most of all exposed to assaults. That is watchfulness, when one sees that the matter is not that the external condition of the assailed one is altered and improved, that the prison should be opened for the prisoner, but rather that he continues internally in joy and boldness to be an unhampered witness of the gospel, especially of the marrow of the gospel, full of life, of the profoundest contents of revelation, thus enabled amid all outward disgrace before the world to preserve the inward dignity of a child and servant of God, of His ambassador.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

About nothing does man have such indistinct views as about his own strength. Every one, be he never so weak, thinks himself strong: this is proved by his resolutions, his plans, which have been mostly frustrated and shattered. It is with strength as with beauty, which no one even the ugliest thinks is far off. Indeed man is often afraid for himself just where there is nothing to fear, as the miser of unnecessary expense, the ambitious man of renouncing something, not knowing their own weakness. That in the Lord alone, the strong and mighty One, strength is to be sought and found, all those do not consider who are unwilling to ground true freedom in the service of God; only the children of God are strong, and he who stands fast on the soil of Divine precepts, eternal principles, has unconquerable might. He who is overcome by God and holds to Him, overcomes himself and the enemies without him.—The conflict is stirred by a powerful enemy without us, who is the more dangerous, the more allies he finds within us in our flesh and blood, in our natural man. Were there no false friends in us, the enemy, Satan, without us would not have so great power.—The Christian alone is assailed; he who is not assailed is no Christian, either no longer, or not yet. Satan does not attack his own, but rather uses them only in assaulting believers.—In the panoply of God all temptations of the devil turn out to be trials

from God, in which we become stronger and more invincible.—The girdle of the Christian warrior is a chain of eternal truths, his breastplate is righteousness which avails before God, his war-shoes are skill in Gospel testimony in word and deed without precipitancy in peaceableness; his shield is that faith of the heart which hangs on Christ, securing against seven darts, those of sin, virtue, the world, the cross, despair, calumny and death (H. MUELLER); the helmet is the hope of everlasting salvation, and the short sword is the apprehended word from God, which has the edge and point to parry as drawn by the Lord Himself. Only learn how to choose and use such texts as Matt. iv. 4, 7, 10! See thou hast the sword of the Spirit! 1. The sword which is of the Spirit is a word, God's word, but this word is a sword. 2. The Spirit, whose the sword is, is the Holy Spirit, not theology, not polity, nor confession, neither letter nor man's reason.—Without God's word reason and strength were a leaden banner, a lance without a head, a sword without an edge.—To handle the sword of the Spirit thou needest the strength of God. HAMANN says aptly, the breastplate is no bodice but a breast-plate, to which a champion is as much accustomed as patrons to their loose clothes. From supplication we first learn how to pray for ourselves rightly.—More depends on internal than on external freedom. To be free in chains and bonds, to be full of pure joy in tribulation, to be oppressed and yet freehearted, is the Apostle's wish and precept.

STARKE: Do you suppose that Christianity comes off without a conflict or that you will receive a crown of glory without having contended? You deceive yourself. Daily must you be in the combat and show good knighthood in faith. Do you ask: who then are my enemies? look into your own breast and there you will find sinful lusts, warring against you; sloth and sleepiness, clouding thy spirit, unbelief and doubt, wounds of conscience, disturbing you, *etc.* Without you are Satan and the world, setting their nets. If you are not properly armed in faith against these enemies, you will go to ruin. —Since artifice is so much more dangerous than force, we must specially protect ourselves against this.—He who is well armed can composedly look the devil in the face and stand up to him foot to foot; he will assuredly conquer.—A good conscience is the Christian's breastwork.—The less sin, the less the power of the devil.—Let a believing Christian take especial care that he guards his heart.—When the enemy is there it is too late to begin to arm; prepare yourself beforehand and be always ready.—Where there is no faith, there is no armor that avails against Satan; all is lost.—The word of God is necessary for all men, even for the overcoming of spiritual adversaries. How can the Romish Church answer for this, that they have refused this to their poor people?—Prating is not praying. He who has not the spirit of prayer, cannot pray aright.—Strong, well-fortified and blessed souls need our intercessions also.—Ye hearers, why is it that your teacher is so dull and that he cannot speak with power to your conscience! The answer is: you do not pray for him! Oh, as often as he enters the pulpit, so often should your mind and your whole heart rise to the Lord, praying earnestly that he may with boldness and great impression speak to your souls.—Oh how much useless stuff is often brought out from the pulpit! Let him who appears before the Lord, see to it that he speaks nothing else than God's word.

RIEGER: A good warrior needs *inward courage* and then *outward armor.*—The devil has a great advantage when his power is denied or deemed trifling. For there is then the less arming against him.—The magnificent names which the Apostle applies to these powers arranged in the kingdom of darkness, we must never look at in themselves, for then they might appear to be expressed only to increase the fear of our hearts; but when we consider in addition the destruction of all these works which is announced in the Gospel, they serve rather to exalt the name of Christ.—In the entire period of life, during which we find ourselves placed on the field of conflict, there still occurs some one occasion which constitutes the *evil day*, and upon which it depends whether the purpose of the enemy be repelled, our will for good, taken from God's word and Spirit, become strengthened and thus God's will toward us be accomplished.—It is really a principal part of the honorable condition of the children of God, that they cannot only present their own concerns in prayer to Him, but also assume those of others in supplication.—There is here however no approval of an indolent leaning upon the intercessions of others, such as Simon sought with a heart "not right" (Acts vi. 24), or of a self-interested application of intercession, such as our Saviour rebuked in the Pharisee (Matt. xxiii. 14), but we are to understand a common contest and mutual help in prayer.

HEUBNER: Weapons of human prudence, the *straw-armor* of our reason, as Luther says, are not sufficient against the evil, spiritual powers. If God is not with us, with His counsel and His strength, all is in vain.—The Christian must ever stand, ever be armed, because there is always a conflict. A fool does not know what kind of a contest there is going to be! He calls the evil powers the fancies of benighted ones.—As among the Spartans the saying was: "either with this or on this," so the Christian should either preserve his shield of faith or die on it.—No one is so strong that he can do without the intercession of others. Even a Paul still needed strengthening and stimulus. The word to be preached is given by the Lord; the Lord opens the mouth. From Him must come the impulse to speak; he who preaches according to his own fancies and pleasure accomplishes nothing. The Gospel is to the perverted heart always a mystery.

PASSAVANT: Paul was a man of God and as such of varied and great experience in all these conflicts.—The more earnestly Paul contended, the more earnestly did his love for the Christians, the brethren, the churches of the Lord, fear and tremble.—Paul is the *ambassador* on behalf of the Gospel and on account of the preaching of it *in bonds.*—This office has its sorrows and dangers; it has heights and also abysses, a destruction, a condemnation, a death.

STIER: As certainly as you can count upon God's help, so necessary is *your own activity* in

the use of *means*, which God proffers that you may offer resistance.—To withstand the enemy and to stand is already the entire, difficult triumph.—We are not however once for all done with girding, putting on, grasping our arms and armor; in the midst of the conflict we must constantly look after them and keep them in order.—The contest, the enemies, the field of battle, the equipment,—that is all; but the arms, which the Spirit gives, can be managed only with the prayer of our spirit, can be attained, put on and grasped only through prayer.—*An ambassador in bonds!* But although bound, he can still proclaim unhindered and conduct properly his embassy.—GERLACH: Bound with a chain to a soldier, Paul preached the Gospel and dictated this Epistle, from which the Christian Church in all ages has received so much love and pleasure.

On the Epistle for the 21st Sunday after Trinity [vers. 10–17].—HERBERGER: The hand-book (*Enchiridion*) of a Christian knight. 1. What kind of heart and courage such an one must have to appear in the place of review. 2. Who is his chief Captain, to whom he must have regard. 3. What kind of equipment he must have, what is the best armory, the best arsenal. 4. Who are his worst enemies. 5. How he ought and must accustom himself to his armor. 6. What a severe regimen he must carry out. 7. Finally what he has to expect, if he conduct himself in a knightly manner.—LISCO: The sacred combat of the Christian: 1. The cause for which he contends (vers. 10, 11); 2. The enemies against which he contends (vers. 12, 13); 3. The weapons with which he contends (vers. 14–17).—RAUTENBERG: Be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might! How the equipment with the whole armor of God is 1) so indispensable, 2) so accessible, 3) so glorious.—HARLESS: The bond of Christian fellowship consists: 1) in the assurance of the same contest for all; 2) in the possession of the same arms; 3) in the command to accordant love.—*Gesetz und Zeugniss* [a German periodical]: The secret conflict of the Christian. 1) The secret of his danger, 2) of his strength, 3) of his victory.—MUENKEL: The Apostle's war-sermon shows 1) the enemy against whom, 2) the armor in which, 3) the kingdom for which we contend.—PRÖHLE: The Christian warrior. 1. The host of foes against him (ver. 12); 2. The heroic spirit in which he goes forth (vers. 10, 11); 3. The armor he bears (vers. 13–17).

[HODGE: Vers. 10–13. As a conflict is inevitable, the believer should: 1. Muster strength for the struggle. 2. He should seek that strength from Christ. 3. Since his enemies are not human, but superhuman, he needs not only more than human strength, but also Divine armor.—Ver. 10. He who rushes into this conflict without Christ has not strength even to reach the field. When most empty of self, we are most full of God.—Ver. 14. With the flowing garments of the East, the first thing to be done in preparing for any active work was to gird the loins. To enter on this spiritual conflict ignorant or doubting, would be to enter battle blind or lame.—A warrior without his breast-plate was naked, exposed to every thrust of his enemy, and even to every casual dart. In such a state flight or death is inevitable.—Ver. 15. In ancient warfare swiftness of foot was one of the most important qualifications for a good soldier. As the Gospel secures our peace with God, and gives assurance of His favor, it produces that joyful alacrity of mind which is essential to success in the spiritual conflict.—Ver. 16. It is a common experience of the people of God, that at times horrible thoughts, unholy, blasphemous, sceptical, malignant crowd upon the mind, which cannot be accounted for on any ordinary law of mental action, and which cannot be dislodged. There are others which enkindle passion, inflame ambition, excite cupidity, pride, discontent, or vanity. Against these most dangerous weapons of the evil one, the only protection is faith.—Ver. 17. This sword puts to flight all the powers of darkness; it is true in the individual experience of the Christian, and in the experience of the church collective. All her triumphs over sin and error have been effected by the Word of God. When anything else takes its place, the Church, or the Christian, is at the mercy of the adversary.—Ver. 18. To obtain strength to use this armor aright, and to secure victory, we should pray. These prayers should be: 1. Of all kinds; 2. On every occasion; 3. Importunate and persevering; 4. By the aid of the Holy Spirit; 5. For all saints.—R.]

[EADIE:—Ver. 10. The valor is as spiritual as the armor.—Ver. 11. The great enemy of man, a veteran fierce and malignant has a method of warfare peculiar to himself, for it consists of "wiles." His battles are the rush of a sudden ambuscade.—Ver. 12. It is no vulgar herd of fiends we encounter, but such of them as are darkly eminent in place and dignity.—Ver. 16. The biography of Luther and Bunyan affords apposite examples of these fiery darts.—Ver. 17. The Captain of salvation set the example, and once and again, and a third time, did He repel the assault of the prince of darkness by three brief and simple citations from Scripture.—Ver. 18. "'Praying always'—what does it mean? Being always on our knees? always engaged in the act of prayer? This I believe to be one of the grossest glosses that Satan casts on that text. He has often given it that gloss; monkery, nunnery, abstraction from the world in order to give up one's self to prayer, are but the effects of that false gloss" (EVANS).—"All the saints" pray for us, and in a spirit of reciprocity it becomes us to pray for them.—Ver. 19. "The mystery of the Gospel." It is a system which lay hidden till God's time came for revealing it. To know it there must be a Divine initiator, for its truths are beyond the orbit of human anticipations. The God-man, a vicarious death, gratuitous pardon, the influence of the Spirit—are doctrines which man never could have discovered. This Gospel, without mutilation, in its fulness and majesty, and with all its characteristic elements, the Apostle wishes to proclaim with plain and unfaltering freedom.—Ver. 20. The Apostle's earnest wish was, that he might expound his message in a manner that became him and his high commission, that his imprisonment might have no dispiriting effect upon him, and that he might not in his addresses compromise the name and dignity of an ambassador for Christ.—R.]

IV. CLOSE OF THE EPISTLE.

Chapter VI. 21–24.

1. *Personal intelligence is brought by the bearer of the letter.*

Chap. VI. 21, 22.

21 But that ye also may know[1] my affairs, *and* how I do [the things concerning me.
how I fare][2], Tychicus, a [the] beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord,
22 shall make known to you all things [shall make all known[3] to you]: Whom I have
sent unto you for the same [this very] purpose, that ye might [may][4] know our
affairs, and *that* he might [may] comfort your hearts.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 21.—[The order in B. K. L., great majority of cursives, fathers, is: εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς (so Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford); ℵ. A. D. E. F. G., Latin fathers: καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε (so Lachmann, Ellicott). The former admits of the best explanation of the variation (see Meyer).—R.]

[2] Ver. 21.—[*How I fare* is less ambiguous than *How I do*, while *the things concerning me* is literal and avoids the somewhat uneuphonic juxtaposition: *my affairs, how I fare.*—R.]

[3] Ver. 21.—[The order: ὑμῖν γνωρίσει is accepted by Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott on the authority of A. K. L., nearly all cursives, good versions, fathers, although ℵ. B. D. E. F. (Lachmann) sustain γνωρίσει ὑμῖν. The probability of a conformation to Col. iv. 7 leads to this view.—The E. V. deviates from the order of the Greek, which would be best brought out by a change to the passive form: "all shall be made known to you by Tychicus, the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord, whom I have sent," *etc.* Alford: "Tychicus shall make known all to you, the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord, whom," *etc.*—R.]

[4] Ver. 22.—[*May* instead of "might," "in accordance with the law of the succession of the tenses" (Ellicott).—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 21. **But that ye also may know**, ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς.—Passing over to another subject (δέ) the Apostle hastens from the intercession for himself to a conclusion. He wishes that in order to make proper intercession for him, they might also know his condition more exactly, referring them, however, to oral communications. The καί before ὑμεῖς points to others (Bengel: *perinde ut alii*). The immediate antithesis is Tychicus and those who are near Paul in his imprisonment. Not merely those about him (ver. 22: τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν), even those more remote should know respecting him. It cannot be in antithesis to the Apostle himself (Rueckert and others); this gives no meaning. Even Stier's view: You also on your part should know what I on my part experience and suffer, does not correctly explain the καί before ὑμεῖς. To think of the Colossians (Harless, Meyer, Bleek) or of Timothy (comp. 2 Tim iv. 12) is not warranted by anything in the passage.*

The things concerning me, how I fare, set forth a double object of the communication: τὰ κατ᾽ ἐμέ (Phil. i. 12; Col. iv. 7) denotes the external circumstances, τί πράσσω the personal demeanor and state in the same.*—**Tychicus—shall make all known to you.**—Πάντα comprises what has already been referred to, pointing to the full and detailed deportment (γνωρίσει) of Tychicus, who is mentioned in Acts xx. 4; Col. iv. 7, 8; 2 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. iii. 12, without imparting any further information than that he was a native of Asia and a serviceable companion of Paul, who here characterizes him as:

The beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord.—Ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφός designates him as a stout-hearted Christian, καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος as a reliable servant, a servant of the gospel, in accordance with the context, which indicates that Tychicus would come not for personal reasons, but in the interest of the Church (παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν), and in agreement with Col. iv. 7 (where "minister and fellow-servant in the Lord" marks him as a servant who with Paul is a δοῦλος of Christ). We should not then think (of the ecclesiastical office of the diaconate (Estius), nor yet of a personal servant to Paul himself (Meyer).† The added phrase ἐν κυρίῳ, "in the Lord," is to be joined with both ἀδελφός and διάκονος, since they are connected without the article, thus confirming the reference to the ministry of the gospel,

* [Alford: "As *I* have been going at length into the matters concerning *you*, so if *you also* on your part, wish to know," *etc.* But this is scarcely an obvious antithesis. Hodge explains indefinitely: "You as well as other Christian friends who have manifested solicitude about me in my bonds." The presence of καί here has been used as an argument in favor of the priority of the Epistle to the Colossians, who are supposed to be referred to (antithetically) in καί, but though its presence would be naturally explained were the priority of that Epistle fully established, it scarcely amounts to an argument in favor of that hypothesis.—R.]

* [Not "what I do," for Paul always did one thing (Meyer).—R.]

† [Alford and Ellicott follow Meyer, in taking διάκονος in the sense of "servant," Paul's servant, not the servant of the gospel; they also join ἐν κυρίῳ with this term alone, as indicating that his service for Paul was yet in Christ. But Braune's view is the more natural one—The adjective πιστός here means "trusty," "trustworthy," but with no reference to the trustworthiness of his message, as Chrysostom and Bengel imply, since he was probably known to the Ephesians, though not to the Colossians (Meyer).—R.]

through which he is a brother; his Christian character he manifests in the service of Christianity. Christ is the sphere of life and effort for Tychicus: hence ἐν κυρίῳ, which refers back to ἀδελφός also.

Ver. 22. **Whom I have sent unto you for this very purpose**, ὃν ἔπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, for the very purpose, which has been already mentioned ["I have sent" is on the whole preferable to "I send" (WORDSWORTH) or "I sent" (ALFORD).—R.]—**That ye may know our affairs.***—Ἵνα must be parallel to the first one, as γνῶτε to εἰδῆτε, Τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν merely extends the circle: the situation, not merely of the Apostle, but of his companions also (Col. iv. 10–14; Philemon 10, 23, 24). Paul does not send there merely in his own interest.

And that he may comfort your hearts, καὶ παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν.—This denotes the consequence of communication, or the impression which accompanies it. Accordingly it is not necessary to give prominence to ministerial address as the signification here (STIER). BENGEL: *Ne offenderetis in vinculis meis.* ["It is better, however, owing to our ignorance of the exact state of the church, to leave the precise reference undefined, and to extend it generally to all particulars in which they needed it" (ELLICOTT).—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Personal* and *Congregational interests* stand in close connection. Still the latter are the preponderating ones; the former must fall into the back-ground. 2. *Independency.* The proposition of Robinson in the beginning of the 17th century: *cœtum quemlibet particularem esse totam, integram et perfectam ecclesiam ex suis partibus constantem immediate et* INDEPENDENTEM (*quoad alias ecclesias sub ipso Christo*), cannot be justified from the Apostolic age, in which the local churches stood in active intercourse and received suggestions from various quarters. [Every attempt to carry into practice this extreme view of Robinson has resulted either in ecclesiastical anarchy or a quasi-independency, such as exists in Congregational churches.—R.]

3. Our times are successful in spreading intelligence in many ways from one parish to another. This is well both for those who desire such personally imparted communications, and for those who make a sacrifice in this service, in order to receive as well as give refreshing, revival, consolation and strength. It always happens so, where the inner life is in action, even though the organization and polity are still incomplete, as in the early churches. Care however should be taken, that there be not mixed with this a dissipation of the strength required for the immediate task, or the merest of curiosity. It is precisely the fresh, glad taking root in the local churches which bears flower and fruit to be imparted for the edification of other churches. [These remarks, so pertinent to such an event as the sending of Tychicus, have a bearing on the influence of ecclesiastical bodies on the congregations within whose bounds they assemble, but more especially on the labors of those ministers who travel from place to place as "evangelists," "revival preachers." The good and the evil attendant on their labors are clearly indicated above. Such journeyings find their parallel not in the travel of the Apostles, but in those of Tychicus.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Comp. *Doctr. Notes.* — STARKE: — Preachers should behave to each in a friendly, peaceable, affectionate, brotherly manner.—It pleases God very much, when preachers are concerned for their hearers, and hearers for their preachers.—RIEGER:—More particular intelligence respecting each other awakens also the more fitting intercession for each other.—[It ought to be the aim of the "religious newspaper," to do for churches and families what Tychicus was to do for Paul: Communicate such personal intelligence as would comfort the hearts of those who read. Those editors who do this rather than to minister to pride or to provoke angry discussion, well deserve the title "beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord."—R.]

* [ALFORD, referring to the fact that this verse occurs word for word in Col. iv. 8, except that γνῷ τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν is substituted there, asks: "Does not this variation bear the mark of genuineness with it?" Braune (*Colossians*, p. 82) accepts the reading which conforms exactly to this verse, but the other is defended in the additional notes.—R.]

2. *Twofold salutation to the Church.*

(CHAP. VI. 23, 24.)

23 Peace *be* to the brethren, and love with faith, from God the Father and the Lord
24 Jesus Christ. Grace *be* with all them that [those who] love our Lord Jesus Christ
in sincerity [incorruption]. Amen. [*omit* Amen.][1]

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 24. [The *Rec.* inserts ἀμήν, with ℵ.[3] D. K. L., most versions and fathers, but, as it is not found in ℵ.[1] A. B. F. G. 2 cursives and good minor authorities, it is rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Ellicott and most recent editors, as a liturgical gloss. In regard to such concluding words, the obvious rule is that *good* authority is sufficient to warrant a rejection, preponderating external evidence being of itself insufficient to establish the genuineness.

The SUBSCRIPTION in the *Rec.*, with K. L., is: πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἀπὸ Ῥώμης διὰ Τυχικοῦ B[2] has πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης. ℵ. A. B.[1] D.: πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, to which F. adds ἐτελέσθη. Comp. the subscriptions to the Epistle to the Colossians. —R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The form of the greeting is altogether unusual; the third person, not the second, is used in spite of the direct address (vers. 21, 22); instead of ὑμῖν we find in ver. 23: τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, in the usual position of ὑμῖν after the first word of the salutation, and in ver. 24 we read: μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαπώντων instead of ὑμῶν. Thus a general application corresponding with the universal Epistle is strongly marked. Further we find here divided into two salutations what is elsewhere comprised in one. This points emphatically from the actual effects of grace within the Christian heart and life to the ultimate real ground of the same. *Finally*, the first salutation begins with "peace," which elsewhere forms the close, and the second with "grace," which is the usual beginning. See on chap. i. 2. The explanation must accept the sense of the words as used elsewhere, unless other reasons compel a departure from it. In addition this original form supports the originality of this Epistle, its Pauline origin, against the acceptance of a pseudepigraphic work.

Ver. 23. *The first salutation.* **Peace be to the brethren and love with faith.**—Εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως expresses a wish for *two* things.* Grammatically the three substantives stand in different relations to each other: the first two are connected as co-ordinate with καί, the third is joined to them with μετά, which unites more closely than καί and σύν, the latter denoting external connection, while μετά points to an external one, to a belonging together (WINER, p. 353). This has its influence on the explanation of the substantives, which must designate internal, ethical things. The first is "peace," as the fruit of "grace," out of which it springs (see all the Pauline salutations) [comp. *Romans*, p. 57], communicated through "mercy," as the salutations in Epistles to Timothy conjoin; we must therefore refer it to peace of heart, peace with God, rest of soul. The next, "love," is something springing out of the "peace," hence love to the brethren, who with us have become children of Him who is Love; this love too is in the closest union with faith. "Faith is the characteristic of proper love (as Gal. v. 6), love is the characteristic of proper faith" (HARLESS). "There remains, however, a distinction, inasmuch as faith is the ground and beginning, bringing love with it, not the reverse" (STIER). BENGEL: *Fides præsupponitur ut donum Dei.* By "the brethren" we are to understand Christians in general, not those in Asia (GROTIUS), nor Jewish Christians in particular (WIESELER), nor yet the readers merely (MEYER).† It is incorrect to take εἰρήνη=*concordia* (CALVIN), ἀγάπη as God's love (BENGEL), or μετά=according to (MEYER). It is arbitrary to introduce here, in accordance with the salutations in the Epistles to Timothy, ἔλεος instead of ἀγάπη (RUECKERT), nor is it pertinent either, since "mercy" effects "peace," and would not occur after the latter.

From God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.—Ἀπό denotes the source, as always in the salutations. *Paulus conjungit* (καί) *causam principem* (θεοῦ πατρός) *cum causa secunda* (κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Comp. i. 2, 22; Phil. ii. 9.

Ver. 24. *The second salutation.* **Grace be with all,** ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων.—Elsewhere (Rom. xvi. 20, 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 23; 2 Cor. xiii. 13: Gal. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 23; 1 Thess. v. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 18; Philemon 25) we find ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; the simple ἡ χαρις only here, Col. iv. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 22; 2 Tim. iv. 22 (where, however, ὁ κύριος μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου precedes); Tit. iii. 15. Paul, after the wish which is directed to what is subjective and ethical, points to its objective ground. The article (ἡ) marks the grace as that which is well-known to all, of which the Epistle bears testimony. The single limitation to "all" is given by the following characteristic designation:

Those who love our Lord Jesus Christ, τῶν ἀγαπώντων τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.—Thus Paul gives prominence to what should be the *agens* in every called and baptized Christian. The twofold salutation, bordering on a parallelism, is thus to be distinguished; the first part points to the inner life of the Christian, the second to the principle on which this life is based, with its immediate effect, love to Christ. In this we find then both an advance and a justification of the explanation of ἀδελφοί. [MEYER and most find here alone the wider reference to all real Christians, corresponding to the Anathema in 1 Cor.—R.] So 1 Cor. xvi. 22. Comp. John xiv. 21, 23. Hence the first wish is not for all members of the church, and the second for genuine disciples (STIER); as if the effect were to be wished for the former, and the efficient cause only for the latter! WIESELER finds a most remarkable reference, in the first, to the Jewish Christians, as especially "brethren" after the flesh, in the second to the Gentile Christians, as though they were not brethren; no reader would have thought of this.

In incorruption, ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ (from ἄφθαρτος, *incorruptus, corruptioni et interitui non obnoxius*, 1 Cor. ix. 25; xv. 52; Rom. i. 23; 1 Tim i. 17; 1 Pet. i. 4, 23; iii. 4), is used here as in 1 Cor. xv. 42. 50. 53, 54; Rom. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 10, where the resurrection of the body is spoken of, and is not to be applied differently. BENGEL:

* [*Two*, not *three*, for the term "brethren" presupposes "faith" there already. The form indicates also, that he wishes for them "peace" and "love" in inseparable connection with the already present "faith." Of course the increase of "love" necessarily *implies* the increase of faith, but the wish is strictly a double one.—R.]

† [MEYER, followed by EADIE, ALFORD and ELLICOTT, takes "the brethren" here as="you," finding in the second benediction a wider reference; Braune, on the other hand, seems to refer to the same persons, *viz.*, all Christians. The former view is the more obvious one, but the latter accounts for the peculiar form of the salutation, and accords with the universal character of the Epistle. Still it lays a great stress upon a form that may have no special significance.—R.]

ἀφθαρσία *dicit sanitatem labis expertem et inde fluentem perpetuitatem.* The phrase is an adverbial qualification of ἀγαπώντων, as Tit. iii. 15: τοὺς φιλοῦντας ἡμᾶς ἐν πίστει. [So MEYER, ALFORD, HODGE, and most recent commentators.] Accordingly it is inadmissible to connect it with χάρις (supplying ἔστω) with the explanation that it is=ἐν ἀφθάρτοις, in whom it manifests itself (HARLESS, STIER and others), still more so, to join it with Χριστόν (SEMLER), as though the glorified Saviour, and not rather the One in the form of a servant, were the object of the love. It is not=in eternity (MATTHIES), that would be εἰς αἰῶνα, nor *in sincerity* [E. V.],* either of love (CALVIN, CALOVIUS and others) or of life (GREEK FATHERS, ERASMUS, ESTIUS), that would be ἐν ἀφθορίᾳ (Tit. ii. 7). LUTHER renders it well: *unverrücht* [immovably]; the phrase denoting that the love is one belonging to incorruption, not succumbing to the fluctuations and changes of the world. BENGEL, who joins it with χάρις, remarks aptly, however: *Congruit cum tota summa epistolæ: et inde redundat etiam ἀφθαρσία in amorem fidelium erga Jesum Christum.* [Comp. the terse and lucid note of ELLICOTT *in loco*, who, after defending the view not commonly accepted, on grammatical and lexical grounds, adds: "*in incorruption, i. e.*, in a manner and in an element that knows neither change, diminution nor decay. Thus then this significant clause not only defines what the essence of the ἀγάπη is, but indicates that it ought to be perennial, immutable, incorruptible." "Not a fleeting earthly love, but a spiritual and eternal one" (ALFORD).—R.] There inheres a mighty earnestness in these closing words, which however may not be spared even with a child; the smallest child can love its mother.

Thus the conclusion returns again to the beginning, and this is the more significant, when one remembers, that Paul, who did not himself write his letters, but always dictated them (Rom. xvi. 22), penned the salutation alone with his own hand, as Col. iv. 18; 1 Cor. xvi. 21; 2 Thess. iii. 17, probably also Gal. vi. 11–18.† See LAURENT, *Neutestamentliche Studien*, pp. 4–9.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Epistle began (i. 2) and now it closes with the greeting: "grace be with you!" This *grace*, God's condescending love in Christ, is the ground and the goal of all human effort directed toward salvation. 2. From grace there is first brought about in the heart of the Christian, *peace* with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, the reconciliation, which drives away the unrest caused by the re-echo in our conscience of the accusing and condemning law, making real rest of soul. Then in and by the side of peace toward God there enters *love* toward our neighbor; both, peace and love, in the convoy of faith which casts itself upon Christ as Lord. The objective grace works subjectively through faith and peace and love, unfolding and moulding the strength and beauty of the human character in every department of life. Christianity animates and exalts in noble activity the Divine in the human, as a whole and in particular, to a blessed and beatifying permanence. 3. We should not be brethren merely through the external church relation, but prove ourselves such in love to the Lord. This will depend on the healthfulness of our *faith*, which in spite of external "progress," hindrances, dangers, influences, proves itself from the beginning to the very close by incorruptible love to the Lord Jesus.

[4. *The closing benediction* (ver. 24). It differs from all other Pauline benedictions; not in what is wished, but in its definition of those for whom it is wished. This definition makes it a fitting close to our Epistle, the leading idea of which is: "the Church in Christ Jesus." For we thus have a final definition of those who constitute this Church: "those who love the Lord Jesus Christ in incorruption." *Extensively*, then, the Church is not bounded by those external limits necessarily established by ecclesiastical organizations, nor by those logical ones as necessarily defined by detailed dogmatic statement, still less by those empirical ones set up by morbid, fanatical or spasmodic religionism. The empire of love is not co-incident with such boundaries. Still this is not the "broad" territory of indifferentism, ignorance, doubt or unbelief, for the definition is *intensive* also. The love has for its object "the Lord Jesus Christ," whom Paul loved. And those who love as Paul loved, must apprehend this Object in good measure as Paul apprehended Him. No one can define how far speculative doubt about the Person of Christ leaves scope for a real love to Him as "the Lord Jesus Christ," but love seeks to *know* the dear object, and those who seek Him will find Him, here or hereafter, "as He is." Love is the best preceptor in Christology. Mere sincerity is not enough; the love must move in a sphere, partake of a character, "perennial, immutable, incorruptible." That Christ's grace alone can beget such a love is evident both from the Apostle's words and human experience. Those who have it are "in Christ," of His Body, which, in a fuller, higher sense, like the Head, shall live and love "in incorruption," through the same "grace."—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Comp. *Doctr. Notes.*

RIEGER: The sum of the whole Epistle was: God in Christ, before the world began in purpose, God in Christ in the accomplishment of our destined Redemption, God in Christ in the saints' appropriation of this salvation provided for us, unto its consummation in glory; hence the benediction at the conclusion concentrates itself upon fellowship with God and His peace and His love. The smallest child in Christ, and he who is the strongest through God's Spirit in the inner man, can unite on the precious heart-point of love to

* [ALFORD, with right, urges that this would make the Epistle end with an anticlimax, "by lowering the high standard which it has lifted up throughout to an apparent indifferentism, and admitting to the apostolic blessing all those, however otherwise wrong, who are only not hypocrites in their love of Christ."—R.]

† [Comp. *Galatians, in loco*, where the additional notes defend the view that the whole of that Epistle was penned by Paul himself. This opinion includes the presupposition that he rarely did so, strengthening therefore, not weakening, the point Dr. Braune here introduces.—R.]

Jesus. The grace remains immovable, and out of this the love also reaches to something amaranthine, which in the heat of the contest does not fade away.

HEUBNER: The love to Jesus must abide, must be immovable, whatever fortunes meet us, however the spirit of the age may change; else it is not pure. *Laus in amore mori.*

PASSAVANT: Here we have an apostolic conclusion. It is a reminder, first, of that *peace*, which comes down from God's heaven alone upon our earth, into our hearts; secondly, of that *love*, which is pure, holy, Divine; thirdly, Paul reminds the Christians of that *faith*, which, inseparable from love, living and active through it, *born of God*, alone is *pleasing to God*, alone gives to God His glory, alone exalts the soul to Him. Fourthly, we are reminded of that *grace*, through which first and alone there comes to us all true, eternal, blessed good, continuing ours out of pure mercy and unto eternity.—The whole of vital Christianity is contained in love to Jesus. Those then who love this Jesus with their whole heart, so that in this love they look to Him alone, desire Him alone, follow Him alone, deny themselves for Him, willingly bear His cross and their cross after Him, living to Him and dying to Him—those are Christians, are God's children, His special, His constant and dear objects of regard.

STIER: If any one loves our Lord Jesus Christ, in vain and in wrong would all the churches pronounce the ban against him, nor are formulas of faith valid against him.

GERLACH: The grace which is the cause of our love to Christ, becomes at the same time the reward of our love to Him; all may be hoped from Him, if one loves Him, all feared, if one does not love Him.

THE END OF EPHESIANS.

[illegible]. The genus remains inconceivable, and not of this the law also reaches to something same complete, which in the basis of the greatest form and falls away. [illegible]

[illegible] all very eternal [illegible] [illegible]

THE
EPISTLE OF PAUL
TO THE
PHILIPPIANS.

BY

KARL BRAUNE, D.D

GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT AT ALTENBURG, SAXONY.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, WITH ADDITIONS,

BY

HORATIO B. HACKETT, D.D.

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

NEW YORK:

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

743 AND 745 BROADWAY

THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

The following schedule exhibits to us the heads under which these may be arranged:—

SEC. I. ADDRESS AND SALUTATION (i. 1, 2).

SEC. II. SITUATION AND LABORS OF THE APOSTLE AT ROME (i. 3-26).

(1) The Apostle's gratitude and joy before God on account of the church at Philippi (i. 3–11).

After joyful thanksgiving for the fellowship of the church in the gospel (3–5), and the expression of his confident hope that God will make this perfect (6–8), he offers a fervent prayer for them (9–11).

(2) The gospel, in spite of insincere or false brethren and threatening danger of death, makes progress during the Apostle's captivity at Rome (i. 12–26).

After referring to the happy effects of his ministry in bonds (12–14), among sincere and insincere witnesses for Christ (15–17), he expresses his views respecting this varied experience (18–20), and calmly revolves the question whether life or death may be better for him (21–26).

SEC. III. THE LORD'S EXAMPLE AND PATTERN FOR THE OBSERVANCE OF THE CHURCH (i. 27—ii. 18).

(1) A true Christian deportment the condition of the Apostle's joy in the church (i. 27–30). Characteristics of a Christian walk (27, 28 *a*); encouraging motives (28 *b*–30).

(2) Christ's example on the way through humiliation to exaltation (ii. 1–11).

After entreating them earnestly and eloquently to stand together in harmony (1–4), he holds up to view the person of the Redeemer (5, 6), His state of humiliation (7, 8), and His state of exaltation (9–11).

(3) God strengthens believers to walk in Christ's footsteps along the painful way of obedience (12–14), to its glorious end (15–18).

SEC. IV. PAUL'S ASSISTANTS AND CO-LABORERS (ii. 19–30).

(1) Timothy and his speedy mission to Philippi (19–24).

(2) Sending back of Epaphroditus (25–30).

SEC. V. WARNING AGAINST JUDAISTIC FALSE TEACHERS AND WICKED DECEIVERS IN CONTRAST WITH THE APOSTLE (iii. 1—iv. 1).

(1) The spirit of these teachers as distinguished from that of Paul (iii. 1–16).

He warns them against the disposition of such errorists, especially their pride (2–7), points out the opposition between the righteousness of the law and that of faith (8–11), and speaks of his humble striving after perfection (12–14), with an exhortation to harmony among the Philippians (15–16).

(2) Opposite destiny of false and true Christians (iii. 17—iv. 1).

He confirms his exhortation to imitate himself and others like-minded (17) by two contrasts· the destruction of the worldly, and the glorification of the righteous believers (18–21); and concludes (iv. 1) with an exhortation to steadfastness.

SEC. VI. FINAL EXHORTATION TO CO-OPERATION BETWEEN HIMSELF AND THE PHILIPPIAN CHURCH (iv. 2–20).

(1) Individuals exhorted to harmony (2, 3).

(2) General exhortation to joyfulness (4–7).

(3) General and final summons to Christian progress (8, 9).

(4) Thanksgiving for the gifts of love from them (10–20).

His joy on this account (10), caution against misapprehension (11–13), grateful recognition of their kindness (14–17), and assurance of the Divine blessing (18–20).

SEC. VII. SALUTATION AND BENEDICTION (iv. 21–23).

The ground tone of this Epistle is found in the antithesis of joy and sorrow which runs through every part of it, not only in Paul's references to his own joy in his diversified relations (i. 4, 18; ii. 2, 17; iv. 1, 10), but also in his exhortations to the church to cherish this spirit. The feeling of joy animates the Apostle in his darkest hours, and that joy is the mark which he has always in view. With ZÖCKLER (VILMAR's *Pastoraltheologische Blätter*, 1864, *Heft* 5 and 6, p. 239 sq.) we shall find the ground-thought in that divine mystery which Peter (1 Pet. i. 11) designates as "the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow" (*τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας*), and describes as an object of hope and longing to the angels in heaven. Expressed in one sentence it is this: Only humble, loving self-denial, after the example of Christ, who has passed through the condition of self-abasement to His exaltation in heaven, can lift us up to true honor, to a full, abiding enjoyment of the Christian life.

§ 2. CHARACTER AND IMPORTANCE OF THE EPISTLE.

(1) The character of the letter distinguishes it in a marked way from the letters to the Ephesians and Colossians. The theme is not here as in those letters divided in its treatment into a theoretical and a hortatory part. It is a genuine outgush of the heart, and bears more than any other a familiar character (WIESINGER). It is a natural and unstudied expression of feeling, without doctrinal purpose or strict plan (ZÖCKLER), although the beautiful organism of the letter is not to be overlooked, and HOLTZMANN (HERZOG's *Real-encyk.* Vol. XX. p. 401) should not say that it is wanting in close connection and progress of the thought. Even the single but extremely important doctrinal passage (ii. 5–11) is ethically conceived, and bears directly with all its force upon practical life. As MEYER well remarks: "The entire contents breathe an inmost and touching love for this favorite Church. No other letter is so rich in heartfelt expressions and tender allusions—none so characteristically epistolary, without exact arrangement, without doctrinal discussions, without Old Testament citations and dialectic argumentations. None is so completely a letter of the heart, an outburst of passionate longing for the fellowship of love amid outward desertion and affliction; so that although at times almost elegiac in its tone, it is a model of the union of tender love with apostolic dignity and boldness." Although the letter of a prisoner near death, it is *melior alacriorque et blandior ceteris* (GROTIUS). Written in view of death, yet full of unshaken hope of life, under heavy oppression, yet full of unbending courage, amid grievous conflicts, yet full of fresh zeal, it passes from expressions of tender love for the church to the severest denunciations of dangerous adversaries. With passages full of elegant negligence (i. 29), like Plato's dialogues, and Cicero's letters, it has passages of wonderful eloquence, and proceeds from entirely outward, special, relations and circumstances to wide-reaching thoughts and grand conceptions.

(2) Hence the importance of the letter, apart from the one doctrinal passage (ii. 5–11), lies in the province of practical life. It treats of the mutual relations of the minister and his church, and also of the general Christian life, especially in regard to self-discipline and proper demeanor in circumstances of difficulty and towards various persons.

The Church has therefore selected from it four portions to be read on the fourth Sunday after

Advent (iv. 4–7), on Palm-Sunday (ii. 5–11), on the twenty-second (i. 3–11) and the twenty-third Sunday after Trinity (iii. 17–21).

§ 3. UNITY OF THE EPISTLE.

This unity appears from §§ 1, 2, and it would be unnecessary to refer to it, had not HEINRICHS (*Novum Testamentum ed. Koppe* VII. *Proleg.* p. 31 sqq.) and Paulus (*Heidelb. Jahrb.* 1817, 7, p. 702 sq.) brought forward the idea that there were two letters here, the one (i. 1—iii. 1, as far as χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ, and iv. 21–23) addressed to all the Philippians, and the other (iii. 1 *b*—iv. 20) addressed to his more intimate friends, the ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι; and that the exoteric and esoteric parts were first united by another hand. This view finds no exegetical support in λοιπόν (iii. 1), τέλειοι (iii. 15), as the explanation of the passages shows. It deserves to be forgotten, or to be mentioned only as a curiosity.

§ 4. AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE.

(1) The letter itself designates the Apostle Paul as the author (i. 1), represents Timothy as one of his associates (i. 1; ii. 19), and refers to his imprisonment (i. 7), and to his former preaching in Macedonia (iv. 15), in a manner entirely natural and in harmony with his actual relations. On this point, therefore, there is no room for doubt.

(2) The external testimonies maintain Paul's authorship. Polycarp cites it (ad Phil. iii. 11) as a letter of Paul's, according to its position in MURATORI's Canon, after the Epistle to the Ephesians, and before that to the Colossians (Eph. § 4, 2), and in this he is followed by IGNATIUS, IRENÆUS, CLEMENS of Alexandria, ORIGEN, TERTULLIAN, and EUSEBIUS who reckons it among the ὁμολογούμενα. MARCION also regards it as an epistle of Paul.

(3) It bears undeniably the Pauline impress in its contents and spirit, its delicate turns and allusions, its language and mode of representation (MEYER, comp. § 2, 1). It should be remarked too that from the subordination of the doctrinal element, as also from the prominence of its characteristics as fresh, original, and called forth by a special occasion, all suspicion of forgery in the interest of doctrine is excluded (MEYER). Hence OLSHAUSEN could still say that this letter belongs to the few writings of the New Testament of which the genuineness has never been disputed.

(4) SCHRADER leads the way to the more recent assaults on this Epistle (*Der Apostel Paulus*, V. p. 233 sq.). According to his view, the passage iii. 1—iv. 9 is interpolated between ii. 30 and iv. 10, destroying the symmetry of the letter and its character as a letter of friendship. This arbitrary assumption falls away at once before an unprejudiced interpretation of the passage in question.

The leader of the Tübingen School, BAUR (especially in his *Paulus*, 1845, pp. 458–475) whom his pupil, SCHWEGLER (*Nachapost. Zeitalter* II. 133–135), ably supports, makes the attack in a different way. BAUR's arguments group themselves under three heads:—

(*a*) The letter moves in the circle of Gnostic ideas, not combating them, but attaching itself to them. Consequently the passage, ii. 5 sq., must have this import: ἁρπαγμός points to the Valentinian Sophia, which strives to force itself into the being of the Father (ἴσα τῷ θεῷ εἶναι) and thus sinks down from the πλήρωμα into the κένωμα; "Being found in the likeness of men," *etc.* (ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων and σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος) are *Docetic*; and the division into the three regions of ἐπουρανίων, ἐπιγείων, καταχθονίων is purely Gnostic. This view also is utterly untenable in the light of impartial exegesis.

(*b*) The character of the letter justifies a doubt of its Pauline origin. The expression κύνες (iii. 2) is indelicate; and the antithesis of κατατομή and περιτομή forced and out of place. The statement in iii. 2 sq. is copied from 2 Cor. xi. 18 sq., and that in iv. 15 contradicts 1 Cor. ix. 15 (ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ κέχρημαι οὐδενὶ τούτων), or at least 2 Cor. xi. 9, according to which the contribution did not reach him at the beginning of his Macedonian labors, but at a later period. The passage in Philippians arose probably from that in Corinthians by an exaggeration. The passage iv. 16 is not historically correct, since Paul did not make a long stay there; further iii. 1 (τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν) indicates poverty of thought; and iii. 6 (δικαιοσύνη ἐν νόμῳ) is un-Pauline. These charges also prove unfounded when we examine the passages.

(*c*) The historical relations all point to a post-Pauline period. Κλήμεντος (iv. 3), in connection with ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας (iv. 22), compels us to think of the relation of the Emperor TIBERIUS FLAVIUS CLEMENS, who on account of impiety (ἀθεότης) was condemned to death, and thus for the first time the προκοπὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (i. 12) becomes clear, together with Paul's joyful hope of a speedy release (ii. 24). Further, in the fact that this CLEMENS, a genuine disciple of Peter, had become a συνεργός of Paul, we see the writer's tendency to harmonize the representatives of the Jewish and Gentile Christians, Εὐοδία and Συντύχη (iv. 2). Ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις (i. 1) is an anachronism in a Pauline Epistle. As to these objections also an unbiassed exegesis removes every difficulty.

Such objections to the genuineness of the letter become in reality vouchers for it. If there are no others against Paul's authorship, we need not be concerned. They serve only to make us feel how uncertain are the decisions of critics who recognize such delicacy of feeling on the part of the writer, and yet complain of monotonous repetitions, poverty of thought, and a want of any definite theme or purpose. LÜNEMANN (*Pauli ad Phil. Ep. contra Baurium defendit*, 1847) and BRÜCKNER (*Ep. ad Phil. Paulo auctori vindicata contra Baurium defendit*, 1848) have triumphantly vindicated the genuineness of this letter.

§ 5. RELATIONS OF THE READERS.

(1) Their external relations. Not merely in the superscription (i. 1, ἐν Φιλίπποις) does the Apostle designate the place of the church, but also (which he seldom does except under deep emotion) in the body of the letter, where he mentions their gifts of love to him (iv. 15: Φιλιππήσιοι). Philippi is first mentioned in Acts xvi. 12. It was originally called Κρηνίδες from the great number of fountains in that region, afterwards Δάτος, and finally, when Philip, the son of Amyntas, king of Macedonia, enlarged and fortified it as a bulwark against the Thracians, about B. C. 358, it was named Φίλιπποι. It became still more celebrated on account of the battle fought there B. C. 42 between the Triumviri and Brutus and Cassius (which decided the fate of the republic), after which it was made a Roman *colonia* (κολωνία, Acts xvi. 12) with the *jus italicum;* but it obtained its greatest glory as the first city of Europe in which the gospel was preached with great success by Paul (A. D. 53) on his second missionary journey (Acts xvi. 9–40). When it is said (Acts xvi. 12): ἐκεῖθεν εἰς Φιλίππους, ἥτις ἐστὶν πρώτη τῆς μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις, this πρώτη evidently designates only its local position (ἐκεῖθεν, *i. e.*, from Neapolis), not its political importance. It lies not far from the sea,* and after Neapolis, the port of Philippi, reckoned at that time as in Thrace (VAN HENGEL *Comment. Ep. ad. Phil.* p. 4), is the first city reached on coming from Neapolis to Macedonia. The capital of Macedonia was Amphipolis (Liv. 45, 29). Comp. Acts of the Apostles, LANGE's Series, p. 304. Paul, along with the happy results of his preaching in the conversion of Lydia and the jailor, had suffered many trials there (1 Thess. ii. 2: προπαθόντες καὶ ὑβρισθέντες). After probably a short stay at Philippi on his third missionary journey (Acts xx. 1, 2), he remained there somewhat longer on his return, though still not a long time (Acts xx. 6).

[Some of the later commentators (even MEYER, *Comment. über die Briefe an die Philipper*, etc., p. 1, 1859) speak of a village, *Felibah*, as still occupying the ancient site. This is incorrect. COUSINÉRY wrote nearly forty years ago: "*La ville célèbre de Philippi ne renforme aujourd'hui que des animaux sauvages; l'oiseau de Minerva se y régénère au milieu des debris*" (*Voyage dans la Macedonie*, p. 17, tome 2, Paris, 1831). The nearest human habitation at present is a Greek κατάλυμα, or caravansary, a mile or more from the ruins, though the ancient name undoubtedly still lingers among the peasants of the country. The nearest village is *Bereketli*, several miles distant. The ruins consist principally of the remains of a theatre or amphitheatre on the side of the hill which formed the acropolis of Philippi, mounds of rubbish containing broken columns and fragments of marble, two lofty gateways supposed to have belonged to a colossal temple of the emperor CLAUDIUS, and a portion of the ancient city wall on the east side towards *Kavalla* (Neapolis). Latin inscriptions are still found there, which show that the place

[* It is somewhat less, certainly, than 10 miles. The recent French explorers (*Mission Archéologique*) make the distance from 12 to 13 kilomètres, *i. e.*, about 9 Roman miles. From the crags which overlook the road across Symbolum from *Kavalla*, the ancient Neapolis, to the site of Philippi, the traveller has both places in sight at the same time.—H.]

was once occupied by Romans. (See the addition to COLONY in the American edition of SMITH'S *Bible Dictionary*, Vol. I. p. 447).

The river of which Luke speaks in Acts xvi. 13 is undoubtedly the Gangas or Gangites mentioned by ancient writers (Herod. vii. 113), and said to be known still as Anghista. It is not a permanent stream, but, like many of the so-called rivers (ποταμοί) in the East, may be entirely dry in summer, but flow with water in the rainy season. When the writer was there on the 13th of December, 1859, it was a rapid torrent, rushing and foaming over its rocky bed, varying in depth at different points from one and two feet to four and five feet, and covering a bed of about thirty feet in width. The stones at the bottom showed the action at times of a still more powerful current. The channel of this stream is only a few rods beyond the circuit of the city, as indicated by the parts of the wall which still remain. For other information respecting the site of Philippi and its harbor, Neapolis, the present *Kavalla*, see *Bibl. Sacra*, Vol. XVII. 873 ff. It was on the bank of this stream that the Jews or Jewish proselytes assembled for worship (Acts xvi. 13), and hence, as Luke's expression indicates (for we are to read there, ἐκ πύλης, *out of the gate* and not ἐκ πόλεως, *out of the city*), they had only to pass out of the gate, and would then come at once to the river-side.—H.]

Nearly all the inhabitants of Philippi were heathen, among whom were a few Jews, who did not have even a synagogue, but only a place of prayer (Acts xvi. 13, LANGE'S Series, p. 304), without the city, near the river, where also a few proselytes worshipped with them. Among these undoubtedly the Apostle gained his first converts. The church must have been composed principally of Gentiles. We cannot infer, on sufficient grounds, that the church was wealthy, either from the case of Lydia or the jailor, or from their gifts to the Apostle. Polycarp indeed, in his letter to the Philippians, censures their love of money; but he died A. D. 168 at the age of 86, and wrote his letter at least fifty or sixty years after Paul wrote to the Philippians. During this period great changes may have taken place even in the outward circumstances of the church.*

2. The internal condition of the church was, on the whole, very favorable. The church could not have remained weak, as the Jewish congregation there had been; for it had ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι (i. 1). It must therefore have been also well regulated. We must not overlook the fact that Paul writes πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (i. 1). This πᾶσιν is omitted in his letter to the Colossians, who were known to him, and in his letter to the Ephesians, while in his letter to the Romans, who were as yet unknown to him, and in his second letter to the Corinthians, it occupies a different position. He also not merely salutes πάντα ἅγιον (iv. 21), but rejoices in them *all* (ii. 17). In like manner Epaphroditus longs earnestly, not after Philippi merely, but even after them all (ii. 26), and is anxious because they have heard of his sickness. More than once, before the Apostle arrived at Corinth, did they contribute to his support (iv. 15, 16), nor did they probably fail to share in the gifts of love which were sent from Macedonia to Corinth (2 Cor. xi. 9), and now again they have forwarded by a messenger their gifts to him at Rome (iv. 10–20). It was this last act, together with the return of Epaphroditus (ii. 25–30), which gave occasion for the letter. They have their trials (i. 29), but remain faithful. Adversaries (ἀντικείμενοι) come among them (i. 28), also false teachers (iii. 2 sq.), and enemies to Christ (iii. 18, 19), but it is always evident that they do not come forth from them nor succeed among them. He has no fear of intellectual or doctrinal errors among them, but only calls their attention to the approaching danger. The false teachers are Judaistic, as among the Galatians, but with this difference, that among the latter they had arisen in the church itself, and had met with success, whereas here they had entered the church from without, and had hitherto met with no success. He is obliged indeed to exhort them to harmony (ii. 1–4; iv. 2, 3), to pray for their furtherance in knowledge and experience (i. 9), to warn them against strife and vanity (ii. 3, 4); but not in a tone of accusation or of reproach on account of grievous errors, as in the case of the Corinthians and others. If therefore officiousness or a striving for pre-eminence existed among them, or the conceit of moral perfection (WIESINGER), the rivalship of spiritual pride, which leads one by turns to arrogate to himself or to disclaim Christian perfection (MEYER), the

* POLYCARP charges two members of the Philippian church with the vice of avarice, but exonerates the church as a whole from any participation in their sin. See Prof. LIGHTFOOT'S *Commentary*, p. 63, note 1.—H.]

tinder of this pride, ever ready for the spark, namely, a tendency to excessive self-estimation (SCHENKEL), or ascetic jealousy (DE WETTE), we are to understand this as applicable to single persons, or occurrences, or as pertaining to the natural man, from whom even the true Christian is not freed. Without this view of the case, Paul's high commendation of the Philippians (iv. 1, *χαρὰ καὶ στέφανος μου*), the praise awarded to them at the beginning of the letter (i. 3–11), the account of his external condition (i. 12–20), and also of his state of mind (i. 21–26; iii. 7–15), become unintelligible.

§ 6. TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

(1) Facts of the letter. According to i. 7, 13–20; iv. 22, it is evident that Paul is a prisoner: that he has freedom and opportunity to preach: that he has been in that situation for some time, and is in such relations with the well-known Prætorium (*τῷ πραιτορίῳ*) that his person and work have become known throughout that camp (*ἐν ὅλῳ*) and among all the others (*τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν*) who would here come into question. There is a church there, which is also not without witnesses for Christ, of whom some indeed are "contentious" (*οἱ ἐξ ἐριθείας*), so that we are to think of an important place in which such dissension would be comparatively of little account; and as, finally, the imperial palace (*ἡ Καίσαρος οἰκία*) is there, the place thus variously indicated must be Rome.

Since Paul has been there for some time, he cannot have written this letter in the beginning of his imprisonment, but must have written it towards its close;—an inference which is confirmed by his uncertainty as to whether he will be finally released, or meet with a martyr's death. Hence we conclude that this letter was written at Rome, A. D. 63 or 64, a year after that to the Colossians, and in the spring, which we infer not from *ἀνεθάλετε* (see on iv. 10), but from the return of Epaphroditus, which the opening of the spring navigation rendered practicable. The subscriptions of the Codices from the fourth century and onwards (B. and others at the end) favor this conclusion.

The Church, which divided the letters of Paul into those addressed to churches and those addressed to individuals, arranged them according to their *stichometric* length, and thus our letter stands before Colossians. Only the epistle to the Ephesians, which with its 155 verses contains only six more verses than Galatians (in the *cod. Sin.* however, 48 *στοῖχοι*), is placed after Galatians, because in comparison with the latter composition the difference in length was of minor importance. (LAURENT, *Neutestamentliche Studien*, p. 43 sq.).

(2) The following are different views: OEDER (*De tempore et loco epistolæ ad Phil. scriptæ.* ONOLDI, 1731), transfers the letter to the time of Paul's sojourn of a year and a half at Corinth (Acts xviii. 11). But the Apostle was not then in prison, and not in danger of death, as at Rome.

D. PAULUS (1799), BÖTTGER, (*Beiträge*, GÖTTINGEN, 1837), and others, refer the letter to the time of Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea. BÖTTGER, not without acuteness and learning, founds his argument upon the misunderstood judicial procedure, according to which an appeal must be answered within five or ten days. Maintaining that Paul's imprisonment at Rome, resulting from his appeal to the emperor, could last only five days, he assumes (since Paul was in prison there during two years, Acts xxviii. 30), a second imprisonment, and by a forced explanation understands *τῷ πραιτωρίῳ* (i. 13), and *ἡ Καίσαρος οἰκία* (iv. 22), of imperial edifices out of Rome, and on account of *ἐν τῷ πραιτωρίῳ* Ἡρώδου (Acts xxiii. 35) he places these at Cæsarea. But on this view he does not explain the other indications (above noticed) which point out the time and place of composition, and creates a new perplexity, namely, how Luke (Acts xxviii. 16–23) forgot to mention that Paul was released, and was not imprisoned at Rome until a later period.

§ 7. LITERATURE.

For GENERAL WORKS see the Introduction to Ephesians, § 7.

SPECIAL WORKS.—MELANCHTHON:—*Argumentum Ep. Pauli ad. Phil.* (*Corp. Ref.* XV. pp. 1283–1294).—MUSCULUS: *Comment.*—AM ENDE: *Ep. ad. Phil. Græce, nova versione lat. et annot. perpet. illustr.*, 1789.—HEINRICHS, *in N. T. ed.* KOPPE, vol. VII. p. II. 1826.—RHEINWALD: *Comment. über den Brief an die Philipper*, 1827.—MATTHIES: *Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Philipper* 1835.—VAN HENGEL: *Comm. perpet. in Ep. ad. Phil.* 1838, (distin-

guished for philological accuracy).—HÖLEMANN: *Comm. in Ep. D. Pauli ad. Phil.* 1839 (too artificial)—RILLIET: *Commentaire sur l'épître de l'apôtre Paul aux Philippiens* 1841.—WIESINGER in OLSHAUSEN'S *Commentary on the N. T.*, vol. 5, 1850, (with fine remarks).—CONR. MÜLLER: *Commentatio de locis quibusdam Ep. ad. Phil.* 1843.—SCHINZ: (of Zürich) *die christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi*, 1833.

On the important passage ii. 5–11, compare especially the following: UMBREIT, in the review of RHEINWALD'S *Commentar in "Studien und Kritiken," pp.* 593–596.—STEIN, *ibid.* 1837, pp. 165–180. ERNESTI, *ibid.*, 1848, pp. 858–924; 1851, pp. 595–630; and THOLUCK'S *Pfingstprogramm*, 1847: *Disputatio christologica de loc. Paul. Phil. II.* 6–9.

For a practical exposition see, besides those mentioned in the Introduction to Ephesians, [§ 7], which include our epistle, SCHLEIERMACHER: *Predigten über den Brief an die Philipper Werken.* 2 *Abtheilung*, 10 *Band*, *S.* 337–804.—PASSAVANT: *Versuch einer practischen Auslegung des Briefes Pauli an die Philipper*, 1834.—MENKEN: *In Homiletischen Blättern*, 1835, *S.* 300–419.—KÄHLER: *Auslegung der Epistel Pauli an die Philipper in* 25 *Predigten*, 1855.

[The following additional works may be mentioned:

IN GERMAN:

1) DR. AUGUST NEANDER: *Der Brief Pauli an die Philipper praktisch erläutert*, with Luther's version corrected by F. Th. Schneider (pp. 1–162; Berlin, 1849). This work is translated by Mrs. H. Conant (pp. 1–140; New York, 1851). The quotations from NEANDER in the pages which follow are to be accredited to this translation.

2) GR. FR. JATHO: *Pauli Brief an die Philipper* (1857).

3) DR. BERNHARD WEISS: *Der Philipper Brief ausgelegt und die Geschichte seiner Auslegung kritisch dargestellt* (Berlin, 1859). An important work for illustrating the relations of the epistle to dogmatic theology.

4) DR. D. SCHENKEL: *Die Briefe an die Epheser, Philipper, und Colosser* (1862).

IN ENGLISH:

1) REV. JOHN TRAPP, A. M.: *Commentary upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians*, contained in his *Commentary on the New Testament* (edited by Rev. W. Webster, Lond., 1865). Some extracts from this work are given among the Homiletic and Practical remarks.

2) REV. ROBERT HALL, A.M.: *A Practical Exposition of the Epistle to the Philippians*, in Twelve Discourses, delivered at Cambridge in 1801 and 1802. (Stenographic notes, but very full, with reference both to the ideas and the language of the preacher. They are good specimens of pulpit exposition by one of the great masters of sacred eloquence).

3) REV. FR. D. MAURICE: *Epistle to the Philippians*, pp. 549-558, in his *Unity of the New Testament* (1854).

4) WEBSTER AND WILKINSON: *New Testament, with Notes Grammatical and Exegetical*, II. 506–528 (London, 1861).

5) T. B. LIGHTFOOT, D. D.: *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians.* A Revised Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations (London, 1868).

6) PROF. JOHN EADIE: *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul on Philippians* (Edinburg and New York, 1859).

The remarks of Professor Stuart on Philip. ii. 5–8 are in the best style of that eminent interpreter (*Miscellanies*, Andover, 1846).

The older Commentaries of CALVIN, BENGEL, HENRY, MACKNIGHT, DODDRIDGE, and the later Commentaries of BARNES, BLOOMFIELD, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, and WORDSWORTH, are too well known to be formally cited.

LECTURES ON THE CHARACTER OF ST. PAUL. By the Rev. J. Howson, D. D. (2d ed., London, 1864). The author has drawn some of his finest illustrations from the Epistle to the Philippians. He shows that the heart of the great Apostle, that the distinctively personal traits of his character, are revealed more fully in this letter than in any of his other writings.

The articles on Philippi and Neapolis in HERZOG'S *Real-Encyklopädie* and in SMITH'S *Dictionary of the Bible* may be consulted with advantage on the persons and places mentioned in the Epistle.—H.]

THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE PHILIPPIANS.*

SECTION I.

I. ADDRESS AND SALUTATION.

CHAPTER I. 1, 2.

1 Paul and Timotheus [Timothy],[1] the [omit the] servants of Jesus Christ[2] [Christ
Jesus], to all the saints in Christ Jesus, which [who] are at Philippi, with the
2 [omit the] bishops[3] [overseers] and deacons[4] [helpers]: Grace (*be*)[5] unto you and
peace, from God our Father and *from* [omit *from*] the Lord Jesus Christ.

* Πρὸς Φιλιππησίους, ℵ, A B F S K, *et al.;* D E have πρὸς Φιλιππηνσίους preceded by ἄρχεται (found also in F G). There are fuller titles, as in the case of the Epistle to the Ephesians.

[1] Ver. 1. [Timotheus occurs in the A. V. seventeen times and Timothy seven times, for Τιμόθεος, in Acts and the Epistles. The anglicized form is the easier one.—H.]

[2] *Ibid.* Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ℵ B D E, *et al.;* A is uncertain. F S K L have Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. [LACHMANN, TISCHENDORF, MEYER, WORDSWORTH, LIGHTFOOT and others adopt the former collocation.—H.]

[3] *Ibid.* Σὺν ἐπισκόποις, B, *et al.;* συνεπισκόποις is a correction [and arose probably, says ELLICOTT, from the epistolary style of later times. The A. V. translates this Greek title by "overseers" in Acts xx. 28.—H.]

[4] *Ibid.* [Instead of "deacons" (διακόνοις), as in A. V., BRAUNE renders "helpers" (*Helfern*), but LUTHER "servants" (*Dienern*.)—H.]

[5] Ver. 2. [The Greek has no verb after χάρις. LUTHER, whom BRAUNE follows, omits the copula here. The A. V. in this elliptical form of salutation omits or supplies "be" without any rule. In respect to the nature of the ellipsis, see remarks on Philem., ver. 4 (Vol. VIII., p. 12 *b*).—H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Paul and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus.**—(Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.) See on Eph. i. 1 and Col. i. 1. Timothy is not mentioned here as joint writer of the Epistle (MEYER), for the first person singular immediately follows in ver. 3, and in ii. 19 Paul appears as his director, nor for the sake of honoring him and of securing him greater influence in the church (SCHENKEL). [It has excited surprise that Luke is not named here as well as Timothy, since he was with Paul at Philippi, when the church was gathered (Acts xvi. 11), and was with Paul at Rome shortly before the time when he wrote to the Colossians (iv. 14). It is conjectured that some unknown exigency may have called him away from Paul just at the time when he wrote this epistle.—H.] The designation *servants* (δοῦλοι) marks their common relation to the Lord of the church, and corresponds to the familiar character of the epistle, as well as its object, which was to express his thanks for the supplies sent to him from Philippi. The church has by this act served not merely Paul and Timothy, but the Lord whose servants they are. BENGEL: *Familiarius scribit ad Philippenses, quam ad eos, ubi se apostolum nominat. Sub hoc prædicato communi discipulum Timotheum mediate vocatum sibi humanissime adjungit, qui recens Paulo adjunctus Philippos venerat* (Acts xvi. 3–12).—[We certainly miss here Paul's customary official title of Apostle, omitted elsewhere only in his two earliest Epistles, namely, those to the Thessalonians, and that to Philemon, which relates to a private matter. We are to attribute this, says SCHENKEL (*Briefe an die Epheser, etc.*, p. 112), not to his courteous regard for Timothy, for he assumes the title in Col. i. 1, where, as here, he associates Timothy with himself; but to the almost purely personal occasion of the letter, and its tone of familiarity, which naturally left out of view his official position. Besides, no one here at Philippi had assailed his apostolic authority, and hence he had no reason for giving prominence to his official dignity.—H.]—**To all the saints in Christ Jesus, who are at Philippi.**—Comp. Eph. i. 1. Πᾶσι τοῖς ἁγίοις, comprises all the members of the church. It is worthy of notice that this "all" recurs again and again, as in i. 4, 7, 8, 25; ii. 17, 26; iv. 22. We are to attribute this to the orderly condition of the church, which rendered exceptions unnecessary; not to the ardor of his love (MEYER), or his impartiality with respect to the disagreement (iv. 2, 3) which existed in the church (DE WETTE), or by way of emphasis with respect to

his more confidential friends, for whom chaps. iii. and iv. are intended (HEINRICHS), or because he would include also those who had not contributed to his support (BENGEL). On τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις see Introduction, § 5, and on Eph. i. 1, and Coloss. i. 1.—**With bishops and assistants**—σὺν ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις. The ἐπίσκοποι are the πρεσβύτεροι (Acts xx. 28), ποιμένες (Eph. iv. 11), the presbytery. At the head of the church stood, therefore, not one bishop, but several elders. Concerning the διάκονοι see Acts vi. 1, 2; 1 Tim. iii. 8, 9. *Illi tum interna, hi externa curabunt proprie* (1 Tim. iii. 2, 8), *nec tamen hi non interna, neque illi non externa. Hæc una ad Philippenses epistola ita inscribitur, ut cum emphatica paraphrasi conjungatur mentio episcoporum et diaconorum* (BENGEL). Paul indicates that as the individual members are united to each other (πᾶσι), so the church with its officers forms a living, beautiful unity, as evinced also by the contribution sent to the Apostle and collected in the church by its officers. More remote, if at all involved, are the supposed references to the fact that it was a regularly constituted church (RHEINWALD), which is not to be presumed as true only of the one at Philippi; to the recognition of officers in the church (WIESINGER); to the special zeal of the bishops and deacons (MATTHIES); to Epaphroditus, as one who belonged to the ἐπισκόποις (GROTIUS, *et al.*), or to the fact that the collection came from the members of the church, without its having an official character (SCHENKEL).

Ver. 2. **Grace (be) unto you and peace, from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ**, Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.—This accords with Eph. i. 2, which compare.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

Comp. on Eph. i. 1, 2, and Col. i. 1, 2.

1. Paul comprises under δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ the relation of both Timothy and himself as servants. So great and glorious is their Master that before Him all distinctions in rank and importance vanish. These distinctions are authorized, and yet care is to be taken that they be not overstrained, or hierarchically established, or abused. It is one thing for the Apostle in his humility to associate himself with his assistant, and quite another for the latter to arrogate to himself an equality with the former.

2. The Apostle in the first place distinguishes between the church and its servants; but, secondly, he does not separate the two, so that the servants stand exalted *above* the church, but places them *in* the church, *from* which they are taken, and *for* which they are employed. Thirdly, he distinguishes also the different servants of the church, and names some ἐπίσκοποι and others διάκονοι, without stating any thing more definite in regard to them, except that the former are employed especially in the training and instruction of the Church, the latter in the care of the poor and sick. But, fourthly, he unites these together as belonging to one body and subordinate to one head. Fifthly, he speaks of a single church as having not merely διάκονοι, but also ἐπίσκοποι, so that we do not discover here the beginning of the Episcopal system, but find rather a college of presbyters at the head of a single congregation.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Comp. on Eph. i. 1, 2; Col. i. 1, 2.

Be not confused by the distinctions among men, nor in the presence of them, that thou mayest clearly recognize the common position of all before the Lord. But do not, on account of this equality in His sight, despise the distinctions which He has appointed. Thou who art more highly honored, follow Paul; and thou who art less elevated follow Timothy. The pastor is not lord over the church which has a claim upon him and his office. The church may have stronger grounds of complaint against him than he against the church.

STARKE:—One must not seek for saints in heaven only, but find them already upon earth. He who does not become a saint here will not be one there.

RIEGER:—Paul places himself here by the side of his young co-laborer, Timothy, that others also may feel a well grounded confidence in him. The kingdom of Christ is throughout a kingdom of love. No one there desires to be alone, or misuses his gifts and advantages for the injury or depreciation of another, but, on the contrary, every one desires to lift up the younger and weaker ones, and to draw them after him. The welfare of the church is the main work. Bishops and servants are appointed to care for its interests and to maintain good order in it.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—When we say "peace," we know that it is the deepest, grandest, expression of our hearts for the soul's true welfare.

[ROBERT HALL:—"*Peace*," ver. 2. This was the term in which the primitive Christians were accustomed to salute each other in the common meetings, and in the streets, and market places. This was sanctified by Jesus Christ. He said: "My peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you, not as the world giveth give I unto you (by compliment, *etc.*): let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." They were accustomed to express all this by the term peace; and the best thing we can wish for our fellow-Christians and for ourselves is, that "peace may be multiplied."—H.]

SCHENKEL:—The true importance of the office in its relation to the church: (1) as an office in the church; (2) as an office from the church; (3) as an office for the church.

SECTION II.

Situation and Labors of the Apostle at Rome.

CHAPTER I. 3–26.

(1) *The Apostle's gratitude and joy before God on account of the church* (i. 3-11).

After joyful thanksgiving for the fellowship of the church in the gospel (3–5), and the expression of his confident hope that God will make it perfect (6–8), he offers a fervent prayer for them (9–11).

3, 4 I thank my God upon every [all] remembrance of you, Always in every prayer
5 of mine for you all making [the] request [prayer] with joy, For your fellowship in
6 [unto] the gospel from the first[1] day until now; Being confident of this very thing that
he which [who] hath begun [began] a good work in you will perform [complete] it un-
7 til [up to] the day of Jesus Christ;[2] Even as it is meet [just] for me to think this of you
all, because I have you in my heart; inasmuch as both in my bonds and in the defence
and confirmation of the gospel ye all are partakers of my grace [of the grace with
8 me]. For God is my record [witness][3] how greatly I long after you all in the bow-
9 els [heart] of Jesus Christ. And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more
10 and more in knowledge and *in* [omit] all judgment [discernment or experience]; That
ye may approve things that are excellent [or, prove things that differ]; that ye
11 may be sincere [pure] and without offence till [unto] the day of Christ; Being
filled with the fruits [fruit] of righteousness which are [is][4] by [through] Jesus
Christ,[5] unto the glory and praise of God.

[1] Ver. 6. [A few of the oldest MSS. insert τῆς before πρώτης. Some copyist may have thought it necessary, but the grammar does not require it. See the exegetical remarks.—H.]

[2] *Ibid.* [Instead of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (T. R.) some copies invert the order as in ver. 1 (LACHMANN, ELLICOTT, TISCHENDORF, ALFORD). The evidence seems not to be conclusive.—H.]

[3] Ver. 8. [MEYER, TISCHENDORF and others, reject ἐστίν in μου ἐστίν of the T. R. The omission, on the whole, is very doubtful. See ELLICOTT's statement of the testimony.—H.]

[4] Ver. 11. Καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης τόν in ℵ A B (which last, however, omits the article τόν) and many others. The plural καρπῶν—τῶν is not duly attested. [The A. V. therefore requires correction here.—H.]

[5] *Ibid.* [Whether the order here is Jesus Christ or Christ Jesus, with the present evidence, is uncertain.—H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 3. **I thank my God** (*εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου*). Exactly like Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 4; Phil. 4. Comp. Col. i. 3.—**Upon all** [or **the whole**] **remembrance of you.**—Ἐπί states the ground or basis (*πάσῃ τῇ μνείᾳ*) on which the thanksgiving rests. This remembrance of Paul extends through his life; he contemplates it as one, as a whole. LUTHER well says: "As often as I think of you." See WINER's *Gram.* pp. 110, 392.* MEYER, urging the force of πᾶς with the article, explains: My remembrance of you is entirely and throughout connected with thanksgiving to God; and SCHENKEL: So far as he remembers them. These explanations are wrong; for the thanksgiving and the supplication go together. Still less can ὑμῶν be *gen. subj.*, as if Paul were giving thanks for their remembrance of him (BRETSCHNEIDER). Further, μνεία is not=mention (WINER, VAN HENGEL), as in *μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι* (Rom. i. 9; Eph. i. 16; 1 Thess. i. 2; Phil. 4). Comp. *μνείαν ἔχειν* (1 Thess. iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 3).

* [The reference here and elsewhere is to the translation of the seventh edition of WINER's *Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament*, revised and edited by Prof. J. HENRY THAYER (Andover, 1869).—H.]

Ver. 4. **Always in every prayer of mine for you all** (*πάντοτε ἐν πασῃ δεήσει μου ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν*). In Rom. i. 8 we have *πάντων ὑμῶν*; in 1 Cor. i. 4, *πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν*; and in Eph. i. 16, only *ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου* after *οὐ παύομαι*. Here, after *πάσῃ τῇ μνείᾳ* (ver. 3) we have the idea of totality repeated three times: *πάντοτε, πάσῃ, πάντων*. *Latum erat cor Pauli* (BENGEL), by his joy in the church.—This clause is to be joined with the following: **Making the prayer with joy** (*μετὰ χαρᾶς τὴν δέησιν ποιούμενος*). [The article before δέησιν recalls δεήσει as *the prayer* in each instance which he offers in their behalf.—H.] Πάντοτε in the preceding clause shows that his thankfulness goes hand in hand with his constant prayer, and *ἐν πάσῃ δεήσει* that his prayer for the church, and indeed for all its members, never ceases; while here in *μετὰ χαρᾶς* we have his frame of mind disclosed to us, and the prayer noted as a fact. It is peculiar to this place. THEOPHYLACT: *τὸ μετὰ χαρᾶς μεμνῆσθαι σημεῖον τῆς ἐκείνων ἀρετῆς.* BENGEL: *summa epistolæ: gaudeo, gaudete! Nam perpetua gaudii mentio* (ver. 18 ff.; ii. 2, 19, 28; iii. 1; iv. 1, 4). *Preces imprimis gaudium animat.* For δέησις and προσευχή see on Eph. vi. 18. It is incorrect to join *πάντοτε* (WIESINGER), or *ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν* (HÖLEMANN), with *εὐχαριστῶ* (ver. 3). It is wrong also to make the participial clause parenthetical (HEINRICHS). [Taking this verse

and the preceding one together, we have then three steps in the development of the thought: First, the apostle never remembers the Philippians but with thanksgiving; secondly, he remembers them in fact as often as he prays; and, thirdly, this remembrance of them was always a source of joy to himself, as well as a cause of thanksgiving to God.—H.]

Ver. 5 brings forward the cause of his thanks. —**For your fellowship unto the gospel.** —'Επί with the dative (preceded by *εὐχαριστεῖν*) quite often indicates the object of the thanksgiving (1 Cor. i. 4). See WINER's *Gram.* p. 393. —*Τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν* represents the fellowship of the Philippians as already existing, and not now as first to be prayed for, and the object of this fellowship is the gospel (*εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*). *Κοινωνία* is found without the *gen. obj.* in Gal. ii. 9 and in 2 Cor. ix. 13, where we have also *εἰς αὐτούς*, analogous to *κοινωνεῖς εἰς λόγον* (iv. 15). The article is not repeated before *εἰς εὐαγγέλιον*, because it appears as one conception, gospel-fellowship. The connection of this clause with the participle is incorrect (CALVIN, *et al.*), for we expect here a statement of the ground of his thanksgiving, and *τὴν δέησιν* has already been defined as *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*. It is wrong also to take *κοινωνία* actively, as *support*, *contribution* (ESTIUS, *et al.*), as in Num. xv. 26 (*κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιεῖσθαι*), Heb. xiii. 16 (*εὐποιΐας καὶ κοινωνίας*), where the context demands that meaning; to refer it to their fellowship with Paul (CHRYSOSTOM, VAN HENGEL), for *μετ' ἐμοῦ* (1 John i. 3) is wanting; to regard it as=*ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν* in ver. 9 (MEYER); to refer it to the fellowship of the Philippians with other Christians (WIESINGER); or to render it: *quod evangelii participes facti estis* (GROTIUS, *et al.*).—**From the first day until now,** *ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν*, marks with emphasis this well-tried fellowship of faith and love as existing from the first preaching of the gospel among them (Acts xvi. 13) until the moment of Paul's writing the letter. [The church at Philippi had existed now about ten years. Among the proofs of this spirit of fellowship and zeal for the gospel (though not limiting himself to them) Paul no doubt had more or less distinctly in view the supplies which the Philippians had sent to him; first, once and again at Thessalonica, soon after his first departure from them (iv. 16), and still more recently at Rome, by the hand of Epaphroditus (iv. 18). Nothing but the want of an opportunity on the part of the Philippians to transmit their gifts, had prevented his receiving still others during the intermediate period (iv. 10). The recorded instances of their liberality, therefore, might well be mentioned as characteristic of their later history as a church. The article before *πρώτης* is unnecessary, the ordinal being sufficiently definite by itself. See WINER's *Gram.* p. 124.—H.]. It is incorrect to connect *from the first day, etc.*, with *εὐχαριστῶ* (BENGEL), or with *πεποιθώς* (MEYER). The aim is to characterize the fellowship, but not the thanksgiving or confidence of the apostle.

Ver. 6. The apostle is *confident* (*πεποιθώς*) that God will still work for them and in them. This participle marks his confidence as antecedent to the *εὐχαριστῶ*. *Hæc fiducia nervus est gratiarum actionis* (BENGEL). *Αὐτὸ τοῦτο* shows that his confidence rests upon God and nothing else (Eph. vi. 18, 22; Col. iv. 8).—**That he who began a good work in you will complete [or finish] it,** *ὅτι ὁ ἐναρξάμενος ἐν ὑμῖν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐπιτελέσει*. Without doubt God is meant (ii. 13), and *ἐν ὑμῖν* is *in animis vestris* (ii. 13), while the context requires us to think of all the members of the church as addressed (vers. 4, 7). Comp. Gal. iii. 3: 2 Cor. viii. 6 (var. *προενήρξατο*. To explain it as meaning "among the Philippians" (HÖLEMANN) is against the context. Not only the context, but Paul's doctrine forbids us to understand "every good one" with *ὁ ἐναρξάμενος* (WAKEFIELD). By *ἔργον ἀγαθόν* is meant not "the good work" (LUTHER), but the *κοινωνία ὑμῶν εἰς εὐαγγέλιον* (ver. 5), a work which is not finished at a single blow, but is carried forward through a gradual development from step to step, through many a fluctuation and danger from within and without, to be made complete in eternity. BENGEL: *Initium est pignus consummationis. Ne homo quidem temere aliquid incipit.*—**Up to the day of Jesus Christ,** *ἄχρις ἡμέρας 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. The day of the Lord's coming for judgment is meant (ver. 10; ii. 16; 2 Cor. i. 14). The nearness of the day is not indicated (MEYER), or the day of each one's death intended* (ESTIUS, *et al.*).—**Even as it is just for me to think this of you all.**—*Καθώς* gives the reason for the subjective confidence in the objective fact (Eph. i. 4). '*Εστὶν δίκαιον ἐμοὶ τοῦτο φρονεῖν* describes this confidence, which extends to each individual (*ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν*), as a duty and obligation which he owes to his readers (vers. 4, 8; Eph. vi. 1; Col. iv. 1). To withhold it seems to him a wrong against them (BENGEL: *justas invenio causas*). — **Because I have you in my heart**—*διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς*. The context demands *με* as the subject; with this agrees the sing. *καρδίᾳ*. See WINER's *Gram.*, p. 329. It is contrary to the order of the words, as well as to the context, to take *ὑμᾶς* as subject (AM ENDE, FLATT, *et al.*). He has them in his heart, because he is separated from them. This certainly shows his deep, abiding affection for them. But this again would be only a subjective matter, like his confidence. Hence what follows is to be closely joined with it: He has them in his heart, and loves them as sharers of the grace of God.—**Inasmuch as both in my bonds and in the defence and confirmation of the gospel, ye all are partakers of my grace**—lit., *grace with me; ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν*

* [ALFORD (*in loc.*) supposes Paul to assume here "the nearness of the coming of the Lord." But that view is apparently inconsistent with 2 Thess. ii. 2; for the Apostle there declares this opinion (which some had falsely imputed to him) to be unfounded and without sanction in any thing that he had said or written. If at that early period (2 Thess. being the second of all his extant Epistles) Paul did not entertain that definite expectation, much less should we ascribe it to him after the lapse of so many years, during which this visible coming of Christ had been delayed. The reason why Paul refers here to a more distant event, instead of saying that God would strengthen the Philippians and enable them to persevere to life's end, may be that the day of one's death coincides so essentially in its moral consequences with the Lord's final advent, and hence was habitually near (as it should be to us all) to the feelings and consciousness of the first Christians. On this topic see remarks of the writer in his *Commentary on the Acts*, pp. 80–82 (revised ed.). See also ELLICOTT's notes on Phil. i. 6, in opposition to ALFORD's view. —H.]

τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου συγκοινωνούς μου τῆς χάριτος πάντας ὑμᾶς ὄντας. The nerve of the argument lies in συγκοινωνούς μου τῆς χάριτος πάντας ὑμᾶς ὄντας; πάντας ὑμᾶς corresponds to ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν, and they are all characterized as fellow-partakers (συγκοινωνοί) with the Apostle in the grace of God. The pronoun μου depends in sense upon σύν, τῆς χάριτος upon κοινωνούς: they share with Paul in the same grace, which he has received. [For the dependence of the two genitives on συγκοινωνούς (comp. also ii. 25, 30), see WINER's *Gram.*, p. 191—H.] The context (vers. 6, 7), defines it as the grace of God mediated through the gospel, *i. e.*, salvation and blessedness in eternity. It is thus not suffering for the gospel (v. 29, 30), as MEYER thinks, or merely *gratiosa evangelii donatio*, (HÖLEMANN), or the apostolic office upheld and made more efficient by the liberality of the Philippians (STORR, AM ENDE), gratitude—*i. e.*, to them (RILLIET), or *gaudii* (Vulg.), [which seems to rest on the assumed reading, χαρᾶς.—H.]. The importance of this co-partnership is the greater on account of Paul's situation at the time. Hence he characterizes the situation under two aspects before he speaks of their personal relation to each other: ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου and ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. The first expression refers to his imprisonment, and the second to his work as a prisoner, embracing his labors both in opposition to adversaries, and for the confirmation of Christians (Acts xxviii. 23). It is not therefore merely his judicial defence that is meant (VAN HENGEL), or his general Christian activity alone (WIESINGER), but both together. It is incorrect also to regard the last two substantives as ἓν διὰ δυοῖν (HEINRICHS), or to separate τοῦ εὐαγγελίου from ἀπολογίᾳ, and to refer this last only to his person (ESTIUS), since neither ἐν, nor the article before βεβαιώσει, is repeated. The explanation which makes the two entirely synonymous (RHEINWALD) has as little in its favor as that which makes the one a defence by word, the other a confirmation by act (ERASMUS). The most natural connection is with ὑμᾶς συγκοινωνούς-ὄντας and not with ἔχειν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ (CHRYSOSTOM, also MEYER). [We prefer with CHRYSOSTOM, NEANDER, DE WETTE, MEYER, ALFORD, and others, to connect the words in question with what precedes, and not so closely with what follows. Nothing surely could be more pertinent here as a proof of Paul's affection for the Philippians (ἔχειν—ἡμᾶς), than to say, that not all his trials and anxieties as a prisoner at Rome, and not all his arduous labors in the church and for the conversion of sinners, could divert his thoughts from them or interrupt or weaken at all his attachment to them. This view of the connection, too, better explains the solemn appeal in μάρτυς—ὁ θεός, which (note the γάρ, ver. 8) seems too impressive to be referred merely to διά τὸ ἔχειν—ἡμᾶς.—H.] To infer from vers. 29, 30, that the bonds and the defence and confirmation of the gospel were common to Paul and the Philippians, (SCHENKEL) is not permitted either by δεσμοῖς μου, or by πάντες.

Ver. 8. **For God is my witness**, μάρτυς γάρ μου ὁ θεός. Comp. Rom. i. 9. He would confirm here his declaration that he has them in his heart. [His earnest desire to see the Philippians was both a proof and a consequence of his earnest affection for them.—H.]—**How I long after you all.**—Ὡς shows the degree, the prep. in ἐπιποθῶ, the direction of the ποθεῖν, ii. 26; 1 Thes. iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 4. The object of ἐπιποθῶ is πάντας ὑμᾶς, none being excepted. Observe the energetic repetition of the πάντας.—**In the heart of Jesus Christ**, ἐν σπλάγχνοις Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, characterizes the ἐπιποθεῖν of Paul. Σπλάγχνα, רַחֲמִים, *viscera*, is the physical designation of the inmost seat of the affections, of the emotional life in the soul (Col. iii. 12: οἰκτιρμῶν; Luke i. 78: ἐλέους); hence ἐν local. BENGEL explains it well: *In Paulo non Paulus vivit, sed Jesus Christus; quare Paulus non in Pauli, sed Jesu Christi movetur visceribus. Nexus hic est: ego vos tamquam consortes gratiæ in corde meo habeo* (2 Cor. vii. 3) *atque desidero, neque id affectu naturali, sed pietate Jesu Christi, inde persentisco eodem erga vos affectu esse ipsum potius dominum, qui rem a principiis ad suos exitus est deducturus.** See ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστός, in ver. 21, and comp. ζῇ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός (Gal. ii. 20). WINER's *Gram.* p. 189. It is incorrect to regard ἐν as the rule or norm, (RILLIET), for it is not=κατά; or to explain the genitive as, *in animo penitus affecto, ut animus fuit Christi*. (VAN HENGEL). It is incorrect to join the word with ὑμᾶς, and to supply ὄντας (STORR). We are to reject every such weakened explanation as *amore vere Christiano* (GROTIUS), or *digna Jesu Christi affectione* (CASTALIO).

Ver. 9. **And this I pray.**—To the prayer of thanksgiving in vers. 3, 8, καί adds further, the fact that he prays, and what he prays for, in behalf of the church (τοῦτο προσεύχομαι). The subject or contents of this prayer are first stated with emphasis, and therefore placed in connection with the subject and ground of his thanks; hence not προσεύχομαι τοῦτο. It is not true that καί connects what follows with ver. 8, and joins still another act, *i. e.*, προσεύχομαι, with μάρτυς μου ὁ θεός, ὡς ἐπιποθῶ. (RILLIET).—**That your love may abound yet more and more.**—Ἵνα points out the direction, purpose, of the prayer, and so the contents, purport of it. Comp. Eph. i. 17; Col. i. 9. Ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν ἔτι μᾶλλον καὶ μᾶλλον περισσεύῃ, pre-supposes this love to be already existing, and that in no small degree, like ἵνα πληρωθῆτε. Col. i. 9. BENGEL: *Ignis in apostolo nunquam dicit, sufficit.* Love of the church is meant, which, as shown by the cause of his joyful thanksgiving (ἐπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ver. 5), and by the ground of his confidence and longing (συγκοινωνούς μου τῆς χάριτος, ver. 7), is more exactly defined to be Christian love. It is therefore neither merely love towards one another (MEYER), nor works of love for the cause of the gospel (SCHENKEL), nor love to the Apostle (CHRYSOSTOM, *et al.*), nor to God and Christ (CALOV), although all these are involved. The accumulative, ἔτι μᾶλλον καὶ μᾶλλον, marks the earnestness of the supplication. Comp. πολλῷ μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον, ver. 23. Περισσεύῃ indicates an increase of this love of the church

* ['Did I speak of having you in my heart? I should rather have said that in the heart of Christ Jesus I long for you.' A powerful metaphor describing perfect union. The believer has no yearnings apart from his Lord; his pulse beats with the pulse of Christ; his heart throbs with the heart of Christ (LIGHTFOOT).—H.]

above the ordinary measure of its possession. (Comp. 1 Thes. iv. 1, 10, *περισσεύειν μᾶλλον*).—How that shall take place is shown by what follows: **In knowledge and in every perception, or discernment**, *ἐν ἐπιγνώσει καὶ πάσῃ αἰσθήσει*. The first (see Eph. i. 17) is a more perfect knowledge of the truth in contrast with a knowledge which is defective, uncertain, confused; and therefore an intellectual act and intensive. The other (*αἴσθησις*, here only in the N. T.) is the perception by the mind or senses of what takes place or exists around us; here in its ethical sense as opposed to a weak judgment, to inexperience, inconsiderate conduct, and, having to do with the entire range of man's acts and relations, is therefore *extensive*, on which account also *πάσῃ* (=*every form of*) is added. [This faculty (*αἴσθησις*), as WORDSWORTH remarks, is that delicate tact and instinct which almost intuitively perceives what is right, and almost unconsciously shrinks from what is wrong.—H.] Both of these, the theoretical knowledge and the ethical tact, belong and go together. The prep. *ἐν* marks each as the sphere, or element, in which the increase of love is to take place. The progress is also a natural one, from knowledge to knowledge, from experience to experience, each promoting the other. Comp. Col. ii. 7. It is incorrect to deny here an increase of love, as if that were already complete (MEYER), or to find that the Philippians were not wanting in love, but in knowledge, their zeal being still *οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν* (Rom. x. 2), *i. e.*, blind, undiscriminating, liable to error (SCHENKEL).

Ver. 10. **That ye may prove things that differ.**—*Εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν* denotes the immediate end of the *περισσεύῃ*. It is in practice, the conduct of life that we are to prove *τὰ διαφέροντα*. As the senses are to be exercised, *πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ* (Heb. v. 14), so here love should increase in knowledge and experience, that we may prove the things in regard to which we are to decide or act. *Δοκιμάζειν* means to test, distinguish the genuine from the spurious (*χρυσίον*, 1 Pet. i. 7), to distinguish between things which are different (*τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν*, 1 Thess. ii. 4; *πάντα δὲ δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε*, v. 21), or between men who differ (1 Tim. iii. 10). The things which experience presents to us are different in degree as well as kind. *Non modo præ multis bona, sed in bonis optima.* (BENGEL). The rendering *ut probetis potiora* (Vulg., *et al.*) is incorrect.—The purpose of this increase of love is: **That ye may be pure and without offence unto, or against the day of Christ.** *Ἵνα* points out the direction of the prayer for the increase of their love. A firm decision for the good follows a correct judgment respecting what is good and evil. The knowledge and experience brought into activity lead to a certain condition and conduct (*ἦτε*): (*εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι*). The first (Grimm, *Clavis* s. v: *ab. εἴχη s. ἕλη, splendor solis, et κρίνω, qui ad solis lucem explicatus et examinatus purus deprehenditur*,* *ex aliorum conjectura ab εἷλος, εἵλειν, volubile agitatione secretus et purgatus*) elsewhere only in 2 Pet. iii. 1, is positive, internal; the second, negative, outward, as referring to persons and relations; hence active, as in 1 Cor. x. 32, while in Acts xxiv. 16, it is passive. We are to look here not to the church or the world, not to the present or the past, but to God who *ἐπιτελέσει ἄχρις ἡμέρας Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* (v. 6); hence *εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ*, **against, for the day of Christ** [not *until*, A.V.] in which this character will be made manifest. They should prepare for this as their great aim (see ii. 16: Eph. iv. 30).—**Being filled**, *πεπληρωμένοι*. The passive refers to what has been experienced or attained, and the perfect to the continued effects of this experience, and thus the participle characterizes the *ἦτε εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι*.—**The fruit of righteousness which is by or through Jesus Christ** (*καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης τὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*). The *acc.*, as in Col. i. 9, points out that with which they are filled. The *sing. καρπόν* marks the harmonious unity, as Gal. v. 22. Comp. v. 19; Rom. vi. 22; James iii. 18. The gen. *δικαιοσύνης* indicates the cause, source. The omission of the article makes it a single conception: righteousness-fruit, more strongly descriptive of the character of the fruit: this fruit is itself righteousness in its very nature. Hence we must not think here of justification (HÖLEMANN). But this fruit of righteousness is not produced by the unaided strength of the Christian without the mediation of Jesus. See Eph. iv. 7, 8; Gal. ii. 20, iii. 22. This truth humbles us because it rebukes self-exaltation, but makes us rejoice also because it shows how glorious this fruit is.—**Unto the glory and praise of God** (*εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἔπαινον θεοῦ*) is an addition to *πεπληρωμένοι*. Comp. Eph. i. vi., 12, 14. Such fulness is of itself the glory of God, because it shows His excellence, and leads to His praise, because men declare it in every way. ["Herein is my Father glorified," says Christ, "that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples" (John xv.).—H.]

* [The above is the generally received etymology. But some derive *εἰλικρινεῖς* from *εἴλη*=*ἴλη*, '*band*,' '*troop*,' and *κρίνω*, '*to separate*,' and hence *gregatim*, 'distinct,' 'unmixed.' HESYCHIUS defines: *εἰλικρινές· τὸ καθαρὸν καὶ ἀμιγὲς ἑτέρου.* LIGHTFOOT adopts this derivation. ELLICOTT prefers the second of the views mentioned in the text (see *in loc.*).—H.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The salvation of individuals is the chief topic of this section, viewed however not theoretically, but practically, in its relation to a living body of Christians. It is a work, a *good work*, (*ἔργον ἀγαθόν*), wrought in the individual (v. 6: *ἐν ὑμῖν*), in whose inmost personality it is accomplished. Hence in its first province it is a human work.

2. In its nature salvation is righteousness, the fruit of which appears in the life (ver. 11: *καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης*), and love (ver. 9: *ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν*), which is self-sacrificing. Hence it is opposed to self-seeking and self-will, and is fellowship with God, Christ, and the brethren. It is, then, in its next effect, a social work.

3. The source of salvation is to be sought in God alone (ver. 6: *ὁ ἐναρξάμενος*) without any merit or worthiness on the part of the subject who needs salvation, and is capable of receiving it, so that he is only the object, the recipient, of the blessing (*συγκοινωνοὺς τῆς χάριτος*, ver. 7). Hence in its beginning it is a divine work, which excludes as well the *αὐτεξούσιον* of the Greek Fathers, especially Clemens and Origen, as it does

Pelagianism, denying the transmission of sin (which Socinianism warmed again into life), and Semi-pelagianism (which Arminianism revived), weakening the conviction of this sinfulness in conformity with its idea of universal grace.

4. Nor in its entire progress is this less a work of God who does not draw back where He has put His hand, who, in the realm of creation and of redemption, in all His works in nature, and in the lives and hearts of men, is ever present, not only as a witness (*μάρτυς μου ὁ θεός*, v. 8) but to complete also (*ἐπιτελέσει*, ver. 6), what He has begun.

5. The work of salvation is mediated, objectively, through the person of Jesus Christ (ver. 11), the preaching of the gospel (ver. 5), and supplication. With regard to the *how* nothing more definite is here said, because it does not come into question.

6. The subjective mediation is indicated under different aspects, (*a*) Christ, He who is preached coming near to us in the preaching, and received in us by His word, becomes our life, His heart our heart, His pity our pity, so that we love with Him, with His heart, with His love (ver. 8: *ἐν σπλάγχνοις Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*); (*b*) He who does not resist Him, receives His strength and gifts, so that by means of these he works in turn; won for Him, drawn to Him, united with those who are like-minded, he lives, and acts, and walks in love (ver. 9: *ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν* ver. 5: *ἐπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*); (*c*) Personal activity is not excluded, but called forth (vers. 9–11), self-exaltation is destroyed, and Synergism has no place here.

7. Love, combined with an active faith, is the central force which penetrates the inmost personality, directs the life, and goes forward step by step towards its perfection. This progress shows itself in a two-fold way: *a*) *Internally*, the Christian becomes intellectually more intimate with God and with His thoughts (*ἐπίγνωσις*). Love thus becomes clearer, deeper, stronger. It increases in knowledge, grows in that and with that. As an ethical effect, also, the love perceives, experiences, feels (*πᾶσα αἴσθησις*), the power of the kingdom of God with its manifold ordinances, and richly endowed membership. It thus becomes stronger, fuller, riper. It increases in experience, grows in that and with that. Thus Christians come to a surer judgment respecting the things which are about them, and concern them (*εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν τὰ διαφέροντα*) within and without, good and bad. The result is *purity* (*εἰλικρινεῖς*). *b*) *Externally*, love acts spontaneously, without calculation, with nice moral tact, with tender conscientiousness, giving no offence, (*ἀπρόσκοποι*). The eye ever directed to the end (*εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ*) animates this love thus progressive to the final day (*ἄχρις ἡμέρας Χριστοῦ*). Pantheistic necessity, all physical compulsion in the Christian's progress, are excluded. Our moral responsibility remains entire.

8. Love in two respects is an object of the Apostle's joy. It actuates all, one as well as another (ver. 7 *a*, and 7 *b*, 8), and redounds to the honor of God (ver. 11). First, though there is a difference in the strength, purity, breadth, and capacity of this love, from Lydia (Acts xvi. 14, 15) and the jailer (*ib.* 30–34) down to the weakest member, the fellowship between them is not disturbed. Every one looks upon the other with humility, and without envy, and cleaves to him. Secondly, the majesty of love becomes manifest, while gratitude for God's gifts is shown in word and work.

9. It is instructive to observe how the Apostle demeans himself here. He is thankful for what is given or done to him; God's act is final; his own doing is as nothing. He rejoices in spite of his imprisonment, since the internal welfare and the salvation of the church are of more importance to him than his own outward suffering. He is full of confidence, for, amid all the dangers to which the members of the church are exposed, from flesh and blood, as well as from the world about them, he has cast his cares upon Him who is greater than he that is in the world, and greater than his own heart. (Comp. 1 John iii. 20; iv. 4). He prays for them heartily, as well as confidently. Without pride of office, without selfishness, without carnal calculation, without meagre consolation, or satisfaction in comparing them with other churches, as in Galatia and Corinth, he looks with grand humility, with noble joy, with childlike confidence, and paternal care, upon the condition of this particular church.

10. [NEANDER:—Paul here (vers. 9–11) gives to love the first place, and ascribes to its quickening presence the knowledge and capacity required for distinguishing the good and the bad, the true and the false; as he himself expresses it, "that your love may more and more abound in all knowledge;" meaning, that *therein* its effect is seen—that increase of knowledge is the fruit of more abundant love. But as here the theoretical proceeds from the practical, the new direction of the judgment from the new direction of the will, of the moral disposition; so is the theoretical in like manner to react upon the practical, the enlightened judgment upon the conduct. Hence Paul adds, as the object to be thus attained, that they should continue "pure and irreproachable" in their Christian walk, until all shall appear before the Lord; "being filled with the fruit of righteousness, which is by Jesus Christ, to the glory and praise of God."—H.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The minister, in view of the past, should have reason to give thanks for the success of the divine word, and in view of the present should rejoice in the growth of love, and in view of the future be consoled as to more immediate danger, and hope for a glorious end. The church should find in him a helper of their joy; ever active, yet without official conceit, a friend, full of sympathy, without selfishness, a hero who lifts praying hands over them, a father who cares earnestly for their future inheritance, vers. 3–11.

STARKE:—God has indeed deserved our thanks. He never ceases to do us good. So also our thanks should have no end. Ps. c. 5.—He will be able to pray to God with joy who regards his prayer not merely as a duty, but also as a gospel right, in virtue of which he may come to the throne of grace, and be looked upon graciously.—To begin is well and necessary, but to complete still better, and more necessary.—The more thou art pressed the more cry out. Remain firm, and be

not deterred. Through scorn we come to the crown.—The longer in the Christian life the happier, the better, is the true testimony. He who does not increase, decreases; at least, standing still is not the right way.—Since the chief powers of the soul are understanding and will, the growth must show itself in them both: the one can no more be separated from the other than understanding from the will.

HEUBNER:—If men do not recognise God as their God, they have no religion at all. It is not a living piety unless they have found God in their inner and outer life.—True love and friendship is ever a religious, mutual remembrance. Remembrance of God is a holy admonition that we live for, with, and in one another. Thus we see how Christianity enlarges the heart. Christian love embraces many; yea, all. (Vers. 4–7.)—Every shepherd must pray daily for his church. Paul had much to do, but he always had time for prayer.—True, inward fellowship of hearts, is a cause for thanksgiving. It is a source of true happiness which nothing can surpass. In our days a repugnance to the closer religious associations often shows itself; for in them religion comes nearer to men, and touches the heart. In like manner too great an equality of many with each other is offensive to some. Among ministers a dread of work is often the cause of this aversion.—There are special days of salvation and grace in our life. These memorable days are not merely birth-days, but rather those in which we have been awakened to a spiritual life.—We have still *churchly* assemblies, but those really Christian are rare.—For progress in what is good one needs grace as much as at the beginning: it is this which accomplishes all. God's Spirit leaves nothing half done. He completes His work if man only lets Him rule. It is disgraceful to us, after God has begun the building, to allow it to stop, or to tear it down. God does not destroy His work, we destroy it.—If thou art anxious about thy progress, cling only to God.—Christian love should not make blind, but clear-sighted. Love lifts up the spirit. The truth is always better discerned through love, and the medium of a practical Christianity. When borne up by others, one sees further, more clearly, (ver. 9.)—Love has a keen, critical character. The Christian has a delicate sensibility, by means of which he finds the right. A Christian's growth is growth in the spirit of examination, and the more the Christian discriminates, the freer does he become from all blemishes. It is only the pure, clean heart, which makes us blameless before Christ, (ver. 10.)—Paul gives here a definition of good works: they correspond to the law, spring from the Spirit of Christ, and redound to the honor of God: this last is their highest object, (ver. 11.) But measured by this rule, many good works so-called lose their value. The Christian should have also not merely single, isolated, good works, but a fullness of them (ver. 12.)—As the Epistle for the 22d Sunday after Trinity: The intimate connection of the Apostle with his church.

1) Ground: faith and love. 2) Effects: growth, new zeal.—Christian friendship: 1) Its nature; 2) Blessing; 3) Conditions.

PASSAVANT:—Without His grace over us, and His Spirit within us, all in us is vain and impure.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—The beginning, though very often the most difficult, is also in many cases the easiest, and not until afterwards do the difficulties which must be overcome, appear. The former exertions then seem, as it were, mere play in comparison with the persistent zeal, which must be shown, if the work is to be brought to an end.—If a man is impelled by the power of genuine love, he is not content with mere experience of life, or with a knowledge of the divine word, by itself, but he seeks to bind both together, so that the one shall ever accompany, support, and promote the other.

KRUMMACHER:—Love for all the saints urges, 1) to thorough self-examination; 2) to joyful emulation; 3) to hearty and humble praise of the free grace of God.—The fellowship of the saints: 1) The duty of thankfulness towards God; 2) Communications from the history of His kingdom; 3) Well-meant counsel: pray and watch.

ASHFELD:—At the end of the church year we observe a thanksgiving festival for the spiritual blessings of the year. 1) We give thanks for the gifts bestowed; 2) We trust God, that He will continue them to us; 3) We pray that we may constantly adorn our faith with richer fruits of righteousness.

LÖHE:—1) The Apostle's joyful thanksgiving for the fellowship of the Philippians in the Gospel; 2) His joyful confidence that the good work which has been begun, will be completed until the day of Christ; 3) His great longing for the Philippians, and for their perfection.

RAUTENBERG:—The signs of genuine thankfulness for the precious gift of the gospel: 1) Hearts which beat for it; 2) Lips which testify for it; 3) Hands which work for it.

OETTINGER:—The greatest joy of the faithful is fellowship in the gospel: 1) Of the perfect joy in pure fellowship; 2) of the incomplete joy in mixed fellowship.

MUENKEL:—The good work: 1) Begun through the gospel; 2) Proved in sorrow; 3) Completed in the love that gives no offence.

The priestly heart of the Apostle Paul: 1) A mirror for repentance; 2) A copy for faith; 3) A pattern for sanctification.

PRÖHLE:—True Christian friendship: 1) The source whence it flows; 2) The signs by which it verifies itself; 3) The blessing which rests upon it.—Most holy thought: God is my witness! 1) A thought of delight; 2) or of fear.—The way to a right understanding of Christian truth is through the heart: 1) It inclines the understanding aright; 2) takes away the bandage which keeps it from discerning divine things in their true form; 3) adds an inward experience to the testimony of the convictions of the understanding.

[NEANDER:—It is customary with Paul to commence his letters with a recognition of whatever is praiseworthy in the church to which he is writing. In this appears his wisdom as a spiritual guide. The confidence of men is far more easily won, and a hearing secured for whatever one has to say in the way of admonition and rebuke, if it appears that he nowise overlooks or undervalues what is good in them, that he does not willingly find fault, but is ready to acknow-

ledge every real excellence with cordial approbation. Good and bad, moreover, stand frequently in close connection with each other. The good lies at the foundation; but the evil mingles its disturbing influence with the good, and hence it is through the latter that we can best reach and remedy the former. It is in the clear perception of this relation, and in the skilful use of it for the correction of error, that Paul manifests his wisdom (see vers. 5-7).—H.]

---

(2) *The gospel, in spite of insincere or false brethren and threatening danger of death, makes progress during the Apostle's captivity at Rome* (i. 12-26).

After referring to the happy effects of his ministry in bonds (12-14) among sincere and insincere witnesses for Christ (15-17) he expresses his views respecting this varied experience (18-20) and calmly revolves the question whether life or death may be better for him (21-26).

12 But I would that ye should understand [know], brethren, that the things which
happened unto me [my affairs] have fallen out rather to the furtherance of the
13 gospel; so that my bonds in Christ are [have become] manifest in all the palace[1]
14 [Prætorium, *or* Prætorian camp] and in all other places [to all the rest]; and many
[the greater part] of the brethren [in the Lord], waxing confident [in the Lord]
15 by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear. Some indeed
16 preach Christ even of envy and strife; and [but] some also of good will. The one[2]
17 of love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the gospel; but the other [others][3]
preach Christ of contention [contentiousness *or* party spirit] not sincerely, sup-
18 posing [thinking] to add[4] [raise up] affliction to my bonds. What then? notwith-
standing[5] every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached; and
19 I therein do rejoice, yea, and will [shall] rejoice. For I know, that this shall
[will] turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit
20 of Jesus Christ, according to my earnest expectation, and (*my*) hope, that in nothing
I shall be ashamed, but (*that*) with all boldness, as always, (*so*) now also, Christ shall
21 be magnified in my body, whether (*it be*) by life, or by death. For to me to live is
22 Christ, and to die (*is*) gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor;
23 yet what I shall choose I wot [know] not. For[6] I am in a strait betwixt two, having
24 a [the] desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better. Nevertheless, to
25 abide in the flesh is more needful for you. And having this confidence, I know that I
26 shall abide and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith; that
your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ, for [in] me by my coming
to you again.

[1] Ver. 13.—[Our English version assumes that ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ refers to the palace of the emperor at Rome. But there is no adequate proof that this Greek term ever designated the imperial palace in that city. The majority of the best interpreters discard that view. See notes below.—H.]

[2] Vers. 16, 17 are so arranged in ℵ A B, *et al.* A few copies have them inverted, as in LUTHER's version, evidently to conform with ver. 15. [The A. V. transposes the verses in accordance with the received Greek text. The object of the transposition was to introduce the subjects of the verbs in verses 16 and 17 in the order in which they occur in verse 15; whereas in the text the subject last mentioned is taken up first.—H.]

[3] Ver. 17.—["Other" occurs here in the A. V. (as in Josh. viii. 22; 2 Chron. xxxii. 22; Job xxiv. 24) in the plural by an old usage for "others." The form has been silently changed in some later editions.—H.]

[4] *Ibid.*—Ἐγείρειν is found in ℵ A B, *et al.;* ἐπιφέρειν is a gloss, with very slight support.

[5] Ver. 18.—Πλήν, D E K L, πλὴν ὅτι ℵ, ὅτι B. These last have arisen from the first. [LIGHTFOOT regards πλὴν ὅτι as more probably correct. Some texts have πλήν alone, others ὅτι alone; both which readings appear like attempts to smooth the construction.—H.]

[6] Ver. 23.—Δέ is found in ℵ and the majority of MSS.; γάρ has but slight support. [It is found in some of the best MSS., and "yet a reading, which comes to the relief of a disjointed syntax, must be regarded with suspicion" (LIGHTFOOT). MEYER regards δέ as the true reading.—H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 12. **But I would that ye should know, brethren.**—The position of γινώσκειν renders it emphatic: *contrariis rumoribus præoccupari potuissent ecclesiæ* (BENGEL). Δέ marks the transition from the condition of the church at Philippi to that of the Apostle at Rome. Ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, together with the friendly address ἀδελφοί, shows that this desire springs from Paul's heart. Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 3; 2 Tim. iii. 1.—**That my affairs** (ὅτι τὰ καὶ ἐμέ, as in Eph. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7,) **have fallen out rather to the furtherance of the gospel.** The comparative μᾶλλον refers to the anxiety of the Apostle

and the Philippians. (WINER's *Gram.*, p. 243). [The result was favorable rather (*μᾶλλον*) than adverse, as Paul and the Philippians had feared.—H]. The perf. (*ἐλήλυθεν*) indicates an effect which still continues. Comp. ver. 25. HÖLEMANN's explanation *quam antea contigerat*, is wrong, for there is no comparison here of past and present.

Ver. 13. **So that my bonds in Christ have become manifest.**—Ὥστε explains how it was that his imprisonment at Rome had contributed to the progress of the gospel (*εἰς προκοπὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐλήλυθεν*). *Τοὺς δεσμούς μου φανεροὺς ἐν Χριστῷ γενέσθαι* mentions the first result of his imprisonment in regard to hearers who were not Christians. As in 1 Cor. iii. 13; xi. 19; xiv. 25, *φανεροὺς γενέσθαι* means *to become manifest.* It is incorrect to explain *φανερός* as *illustris*, *conspicuus* (CALVIN). It is the opposite of *κρυπτός, ἀπόκρυφος*. The order of the words demands the connection of *ἐν Χριστῷ* with *φανερούς*. *Paulus cum aliis captivis traditus par eis visus est; deinde innotuit, aliam esse Pauli causam et sic invaluit evangelium.* (BENGEL). The nature of the information thus diffused, is shown by *ἐν Χριστῷ*. Paul's bonds are those of a Christian. He is *δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν Κυρίῳ* (Eph. iii. 1; iv. 1; Philem. 9; 2 Tim. i. 8). His bonds had indeed been manifest before this time, but had not been manifest *ἐν Χριστῷ*. The emphasis lies on the fact that in this relation they had become manifest or known, and on that account *φανερούς* precedes.—**In all the Prætorium** *or* **Prætorian camp**, (*ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ*) designates the place where this knowledge had spread. On the subject, see Acts xxviii. 16–31.* The *castrum prætorianorum* (SUETON. *Tib.* 37, *Tac. Ann.* 42) is meant, (which was built by Sejanus in the reign of Tiberius, near the *porta Viminalis*), not the *aula Cæsaris* (BENGEL); for *πραιτώριον* is not the same as *Καίσαρος οἰκία* (iv. 22), as many hold. "*Repressaque in præsens exitiabilis superstitio rursus erumpebat, non modo per Judæam, originem ejus mali, sed per urbem etiam.*" (TACITUS *Ann.* 15, 40). [Prof. LIGHTFOOT at present understands *πραιτωρίῳ* in the sense of "*prætorians*," and not "*prætorian camp*," as formerly. (See his Commentary *in loc.*). But with that direct personal sense we might have expected the dative without *ἐν*, as in the other clause (comp. Acts iv. 16; vii. 13; 1 Tim. v. 15); whereas with the local sense as the direct one, and the personal as indirect, the change of construction becomes perfectly natural. EWALD's periphrastic rendering "in all the *Prætorium* among the soldiers" (*Sendeschreiben des Apostel Paulus*, p. 441), gives the correct sense.—H.]—**And to all the rest**, *καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν*, points to others besides the Prætorians, for many besides these could hear, and did hear Paul preach. But we are not to think of heathen merely (VAN HENGEL), regarding the expression as analogous to 1 Thess. iv. 13. The prep. *ἐν* should not be repeated, and *τόποις* supplied (CHRYSOSTOM, *et al.*); for that would be making the circuit too extensive. It is plain from *ὅλῳ* and *πᾶσιν* (which shows how widely the gospel had become known) that the letter could not have been written very soon after Paul's arrival, but at a later period.

[Paul (if we make a distinction between *ξενίαν*, Acts xxviii. 23, and *μισθώματι*, ver. 30) may have spent a few days after his arrival at Rome at some place of public or of private hospitality; but after that he "dwelt in his own hired house," yet under the surveillance of soldiers, who, according to the Roman custom, were detailed from the Prætorian camp to attend him as a guard. But the Prætorian camp occupied an extensive circuit, and "might have contained within its precincts lodgings rented by prisoners under military custody" (LIGHTFOOT). Hence as different Prætorians relieved each other in the performance of this office, Paul would in the course of time become favorably known to many of them, and through these to other comrades. Thus it was soon understood far and wide that Paul had been imprisoned not for any immorality or crime alleged against him, but for preaching the gospel of Christ.—H.]

Ver. 14. Here we learn another fact which was a consequence of the Apostle's captivity, and favorable to the gospel: **And the greater part of the brethren** (*καὶ τοὺς πλείονας τῶν ἀδελφῶν*). [LUTHER renders *πλείονας many*, as does also the A. V. They constituted the majority, but Paul intimates at the same time that all the Roman Christians did not derive the same benefit from his example.—H.] The reference is to Christians, members of the church, who stood at the Apostle's side as assistants, co-laborers; not to teachers (SCHENKEL).—**Waxing confident in the Lord by my bonds** (*ἐν κυρίῳ πεποιθότας τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου*) explains why they acted thus The perf. part. marks this confidence as already attained, and still in operation; *ἐν κυρίῳ* is the nearest object of the verb (Philem. ver. 21). OECUMENIUS well remarks: *εἰ γὰρ μὴ θεῖον ἦν, φησί, τὸ κήρυγμα, οὐκ ἂν ὁ Παῦλος ἠνείχετο ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ δεδέσθαι.* Paul's bonds are to those *qui antea timuerant* (BENGEL) an actual pledge of the entire truthfulness, power, and glory of the gospel (MEYER), and, indeed, as the emphatic position of *ἐν κυρίῳ* shows, their confidence rests entirely on Christ, and not on any human calculation or reflection. See WINER's *Gram.* 137 sq.; Gal. v. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 4. LUTHER incorrectly connects *ἐν κυρίῳ* with *ἀδελφῶν*, while BENGEL joins it with *τολμᾷν*.—**Are much more bold**, (*περισσοτέρως τολμᾷν*), states in what degree they were animated by the Apostle's zeal. The comparative supposes the case of Paul's being free from bonds, (*i. e.*, more boldly than if he were not imprisoned) and does not refer to the time of his arrival at Rome (SCHNECKENBURGER), or to that of his former freedom (SCHENKEL)—**To speak the word without fear**, (*ἀφόβως τὸν λόγον λαλεῖν*) shows what they are now *much more bold* to do, though even before

* [In regard to the passage referred to, it should be said that the words "the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard: but—" in the A. V. (Acts xxviii. 16) are probably the translation of a later addition to the Greek text. See Mr. ABBOT's note in SMITH's *Bible Dictionary*, Vol. I., p. 384 (Amer. ed.). At the same time the words state correctly what was unquestionably true in regard to the Roman usage of committing prisoners like Paul to the care of the Prætorian prefect or commander of the Prætorian camp. (See PLINY's Epist. X. 65). The reference therefore to Acts xxvii. 26 is still pertinent, though not so decisive as if the words were genuine. The false rendering of *ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ* by "in all the palace" (A. V.) destroys the interesting connection between the Epistle here and that passage. See above on the text.—H.]

this time they had attempted it. Hence περισσοτέρως is not to be joined with ἀφόβως, (BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS). Τὸν λόγον is absolute, as Gal. vi. 6, *i. e.*, God's word, which every Christian in his sphere is to speak and to bear witness to. The article denotes, according to the context, that it is the word which the Apostle preaches. The verb is used not merely of teachers (Eph. vi. 20; Col. iv. 3, 4), but also of members of the church (Eph. v. 19).

Ver. 15. **Some indeed preach Christ, also of envy and strife** (τινὲς μὲν καὶ διὰ φθόνον καὶ ἔριν); in contrast with τοὺς πλείονας τῶν ἀδελφῶν we have τινὲς μὲν—τινὲς δέ, in contrast with τὸν λόγον λαλεῖν we have Χριστὸν κηρύσσουσιν—καταγγέλλουσιν (ver. 17), and in contrast with ἐν κυρίῳ πεποιθότας, we have διὰ φθόνον καὶ ἔριν. The καί, *also*, introduces something additional (MEYER) *i. e.*, others besides those mentioned in ver. 14, who are also teachers. Their motive (διά) is a base one, namely, envy, excited by the Apostle's activity, and prompting them to strife for the purpose of disturbing or checking this activity, or of injuring his person.—**And some also of good will** (τινὲς δὲ καὶ διὰ εὐδοκίαν) forms the antithesis to what precedes. We are to take εὐδοκία therefore in the sense of having pleasure or satisfaction, *i. e.*, in Paul's work and person, which includes indeed, complaisance, or a desire to please, but not exactly benevolence. Those here meant are not identical with those designated in v. 14. It is not therefore that they act from conviction: *ideo quod ipsi id probarent* (GROTIUS) nor *alios salvare volentes* (PELAGIUS). Τὸν Χριστὸν κηρύσσουσιν belongs to the two contrasted groups. In their teaching concerning Christ they do not essentially differ, but they differ entirely in their motives, their moral classification, their character. This is more clearly explained in vers. 16, 17.—**The one of love** (οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἀγάπης) points to the latter group, οἱ δέ (v. 16) to the former. See WINER's *Gram.* p. 561. The latter are characterized as οἱ ἐξ ἀγάπης as in Gal. iii. 7: οἱ ἐκ πίστεως sc. ὄντες. They are viewed as children of love; ἀγάπη is their nature. Comp. on εἶναι ἐκ τινός in 1 John ii. 16, (LANGE's Series, XV.) By ἀγάπη (BENGEL: *erga Christum et me*), the generic or essential characteristic is meant; by εὐδοκία the specific as a manifestation or result of the other.—**Knowing that I am set for the defence of the gospel**, εἰδότες presents the motive (as Eph. vi. 8, 9) ὅτι εἰς ἀπολογίαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κεῖμαι. The verb κεῖμαι (as in Luke ii. 34; 1 Thes. iii. 3; 1 Tim. i. 19) represents his bondage as a divine appointment or destiny. Incorrect and opposed to the context (ver. 12) is the idea of his being prostrate *in conditione misera* (VAN HENGEL), or in *bonds* (LUTHER), because by their preaching they make up for his impeded activity, *supplent hoc meum impedimentum sua prædicatione* (ESTIUS). The task which devolves upon him in his situation has for its object the defence of the gospel, ἀπολογίαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (ver. 7), in which these Christians support the Apostle by their co-operation. It is incorrect to refer this to his account before God (CHRYSOSTOM), or his defence before the court, *coram judice* (VAN HENGEL).

Ver. 16. **But the others of contentiousness or party spirit.**—οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας, as in ver. 17. Comp. Rom. ii. 18. Out of this spirit of rivalry or ambition (ii. 3; Jas. iii. 14, 16), which is their characteristic, spring envy and strife, φθόνος καὶ ἔρις (v. 15). Ἐριθεία from ἔριθος, day-laborer, ἐριθεύω to be an ἔριθος, and then in the middle, to use unscrupulous means for one's advantage, is the *ambitus* of the Romans. See PASSOW. *Lex. s. v.* The context requires us to retain the idea of intrigue or party-spirit. SCHENKEL incorrectly assumes the meaning to be "work for pay."—These do the same as the other class: they **preach Christ** (τὸν Χριστὸν καταγγέλλουσιν, v. 15, κηρύσσουσιν). Both verbs designate preaching, but have this shade of difference, that the latter signifies to proclaim Christ to those who have a very slight, or absolutely no knowledge of Him, while the former means to announce Him as present, near. Col. i. 28; Acts xvii. 3, 23. We are to join the finite verb with ἐξ ἀγάπης (ver. 16) and ἐξ ἐριθείας (NEANDER), since otherwise we have a needless accumulation of epithets, and we miss a characteristic designation of the two different classes. The preaching of the opponents is the same in substance as that of the others, but in a different spirit: **not purely**, οὐχ ἁγνῶς, *i. e.*, properly, not untainted, not *free* from coarser, or more refined accessory motives (iv. 8; 2 Cor. vi. 6; vii. 11; xi. 2). It is saying negatively that these do not preach from pure, unalloyed love for Christ.—This is further explained, positively:—**Thinking to add affliction to my bonds** (οἰόμενοι θλίψιν ἐγείρειν τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου). The participle as present states an attendant motive or belief which the import of the word itself characterizes as unfounded, and the result also shows to be false (vers. 18–20), in contrast with the actual knowledge of the true witnesses respecting the Apostle's work and destiny (ver. 16, εἰδότες). Ἐγείρειν refers to the stirring up of further, additional, θλίψις, *affliction*, connected with the imprisonment (τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου), not merely the prisoner, its effect being to aggravate his sufferings. [Prof. LIGHTFOOT finds a metaphor in θλίψιν ἐγείρειν=*to make my chains gall me.* "This word (θλίψις), though extremely common in the LXX, occurs very rarely in classical writers even of a late date, and in those few passages has its literal meaning. The same want in the religious vocabulary which gave currency to θλίψις also created '*tribulatio*' as its Latin equivalent. The reading ἐγείρειν, besides being supported, carries out the metaphor better than ἐπιφέρειν of the received text."—H.].—How this aggravation of his trials was to take place, φθόνος, ἔρις (ver. 15) and ἐριθεία (ver. 17) indicate. Though the Apostle's enemies preach Christ as do the others, they do not, like them, seek to edify the church, and to assist the Apostle, but stir up strife and hatred against him. They preach Jesus as the promised one, that those who hear may say: 'This is indeed also Christian preaching; we need not run after Paul.' They thus draw the church to themselves, and withdraw it from Paul. They preach concerning Christ essentially as he does, only either more strictly to please those who are zealous for the law, or more loosely for the sake of those who are still weak, or in a more rhetorical way, not to offend the cultivated, as does the Apostle. Thus they not merely weaken the attachment of others to him, and draw away his followers, but excite enmity

against him, and thereby make his imprisonment still more oppressive. In their preaching of Christ they go beyond their convictions from dislike to Paul; they make them more Christian in form to do him injury. To understand θλῖψις of an increased severity in his imprisonment by command of the emperor Nero (the Greek commentators, and PELAGIUS, ERASMUS, GROTIUS), accords as little with the contex, as it does to limit the term to his personal mortifications.

Ver. 18. **What then?** τί γάρ;—The question implies a denial of the belief (*οἰόμενοι) Quid refert? utrinque juvor* (ver. 12). BENGEL.—**Notwithstanding every way whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached.** Πλήν presupposes a difference (that is, of motives), while, at the same time, it brings forward what is common to the parties. Under παντὶ τρόπῳ are included what is outward, the manner of representation, the compass, articulation, the systematic arrangement and tendency of this teaching, not its contents as being Ebionitic, or other Jewish views, or Gnostic conceptions (Gal. i. 8). The more exact definition of πᾶς τρόπος follows in *εἴτε προφάσει εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ*. Both mark the relation of the word preached to the character of the preacher; *εἴτε προφάσει* points to the difference, *εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ* to the harmony between the two, as regards the word, doctrine and motives of the respective preachers: on the one side, insincerity, self-seeking, party spirit; on the other, conscientiousness, faithfulness. The first description embraces those mentioned in ver. 15 *a* and ver. 17, and the second those mentioned in ver. 15 *b* and ver. 16, and also ver. 14. It is incorrect to regard *προφάσει=per occasionem* (Vulg., GROTIUS). It is also incorrect to include under *προφάσει* those mentioned in ver. 15 *b*, as if these also merely showed themselves pleased with the apostolic type of doctrine (SCHENKEL). Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται in ver. 17, sets forth what is common to the different witnesses.—**And I therein do rejoice,** *καὶ ἐν τούτῳ χαίρω*. For the construction see iii. 1; iv. 4, 10; Col. i. 24. The cause of his joy is that in every way Christ is proclaimed. The difference in the mode of proclamation cannot disturb his joy, though he must condemn the unworthy motives of his opponents. This joy is not merely a present, but an abiding one.—**Yea, and I shall rejoice** (*ἀλλὰ καὶ χαιρήσομαι*)—let the result of it as to himself be what it may. In like manner *ἀλλά* (iii. 8) opposes the pres. *ἡγοῦμαι* to the perfect *ἥγημαι*. We supply mentally a negative clause—'I do not merely at present rejoice.' Hence we are not to insert a period after *χαίρω*, as in LACHMANN'S N. T., see WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 442. We are not to think here of its being less difficult for Paul to show a spirit of resignation or acquiescence because the danger at Rome did not concern his apostolic authority as in some other instances (MEYER); for joy and an elevated tone of mind pervade the entire letter, and the Roman church was an object of the Apostle's special regard and solicitude, as the Epistle to the Romans testifies. Manifestly the teachers are not like those spoken of in iii. 2 sq., nor are they Judaizers, or Jewish Christians, disinclined to the Pauline view of Christianity (SCHENKEL). They must have been inclined to Paul's system of doctrine, and have approximated to it, but they were unfavorable to his mode of treatment, and unfriendly to his person. Their motives were corrupt (ii. 21), and they were not sincere friends of the Apostle. [For NEANDER'S views on this question see note below.*]

Ver. 19.—**For I know** (*οἶδα γάρ*) emphasizes the declaration as to his joy.—**That this shall result to me** (*ὅτι τοῦτο μοι ἀποβήσεται*). The demonstrative (*τοῦτο*) refers to ver. 18 (*παντὶ τρόπῳ Χριστὸς καταγγέλεται*), and explains why he rejoices, and not to *θλῖψιν ἐγείρειν* (ver. 17), as CALVIN, VAN HENGEL and others think. The use of the verb is similar to that of *ἐλήλυθεν* in ver. 12. [It explains why nothing hereafter can occur to rob him of this assurance and joy

* [NEANDER'S views respecting the character and object of those at Rome to whom Paul refers as seeking by their preaching to add affliction to his bonds, deserve to be considered here.—"Are we to suppose that these men, without personal love to the gospel, without personal conviction of its truth, preached Christ for no other reason than to add to the hardship of Paul's situation, and to bring him into greater danger by the wider extension of the gospel at Rome—thus rendering him, as the origin of it all, more obnoxious to the Roman civil power? It appears at once how unnatural and intrinsically improbable is such a supposition. If they would thus bring Paul into greater peril, they would by so doing plunge themselves into equal danger. Can it be imagined that one would play so hazardous a game, simply from hatred to another? He who at that time did not himself believe in the gospel, must be enlisted against it: and would certainly not have given himself up to the business of preaching it merely as the means to another end. We must seek, then, another explanation of this difficulty. When it is said of an individual that he preaches the gospel only in appearance, this need not be understood as necessarily meaning that he has no concern whatever in regard to the subject of his preaching; that he has no personal interest in it, no conviction of its truth, that he makes use of it only as a means to another end. It may mean that he preaches it, not in its purity and completeness, but as an adulterated, mutilated gospel. And when, moreover, he says of such that they were actuated by party zeal and hatred against him, desiring to add new affliction to his sufferings, it is not necessary to understand by this that their witness for the gospel was mere pretence, a form of hypocrisy to which the circumstances of the time afforded no occasion and no ground; but that their ruling motive in preaching was not from love of the Lord; that it was their aim, consciously or unconsciously to themselves, by their manner of preaching, to give offence to Paul, and to raise up for themselves a party against him. . . . We know that Paul had to contend with opposers, to whom all that has been here said is applicable. There were those who did acknowledge and preach Jesus as the Messiah, but a Messiah in the Jewish sense; who acknowledged Him, not as that which He has revealed Himself to be, the only ground of salvation for man; who, in connection with the one article of faith, that Jesus was the Messiah promised in the Old Testament, still adhered to the Jewish legal position; who understood nothing of the new creation of which Christ was the author, and to whom faith in Jesus as the Messiah was only a new patch upon the old garment of Judaism. These were the opposers, with whom we so often find Paul contending in his Epistles. Of such he might justly say, that they preached the gospel not purely and sincerely, but only in appearance; for indeed they were far more concerned for Judaism than for Christianity, and their converts became Jews rather than Christians. Of such he might also say that they sought to form a party against him, and to add affliction to his bonds; for those persons every where seem chiefly animated by jealousy of Paul, through whom the gospel was preached to the heathen world as freed from all dependence upon Judaism, and standing upon its own foundation. They oppose themselves to him on all occasions, contest his apostolic dignity, seek to encroach on his sphere of labor, to draw over the people from him to themselves, from that pure and complete gospel to their own mutilated one. And it need not surprise us to meet such even in Rome; for Paul's Epistle to the church at Rome, written some years previous to his imprisonment there, shows us in this church, consisting chiefly of Gentile converts, a small party of such Judaizing Christians who were in conflict with the rest. It was a matter of course then, that when the pure gospel in the sense of Paul was preached by the one party, the other, provoked to rivalry, should rise up in opposition and seek to give currency to their own corrupted form of the gospel." (*Epistle of Paul to the Philippians*, translated by Mrs. H. C. CONANT, N. Y., 1851.)—H.]

of which he speaks. He feels assured that the opposition of his enemies will be the means not only of advancing the cause of Christ (ver. 18), but, as stated here, of exciting him to greater zeal and activity, and thus also indirectly of promoting his own spiritual welfare and ultimate salvation. The reference of τοῦτο to the opposition of Paul's enemies (so also LIGHTFOOT) is the most natural, both on account of the sequel, and because the statement that the preaching of Christ must advance the cause of Christ is too obvious to need a formal confirmation (γάρ).—H.]—**Unto salvation** (εἰς σωτηρίαν), like εἰς προκοπὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου in ver. 12, with the meaning (comp. also ver. 20), that in himself Christ and His gospel will be glorified and advanced. Hence it does not refer to his release from imprisonment (CHRYSOSTOM, *et al.*), to the preservation of his life (OECUMENIUS), to his victory over his enemies (MICHAELIS), *ad salutem multorum hominum* (GROTIUS), to *salus vera et perennis* (VAN HENGEL), or to his own salvation in a spiritual sense (RHEINWALD). [Among others, ELLICOTT and LIGHTFOOT adopt this last explanation. The pronoun (μοι) indicates a personal result, and the future of the verb shows it to be one not yet secured. This meaning, too, of σωτηρία is the prevailing one in Paul's Epistles; comp. ver. 28; ii. 12; Rom. i. 16; 2 Thess. ii. 13. See further on ver. 20.—H.]—**Through your prayer and assistance of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.**—The way to this result (ἀποβήσεται) is, first, through (διά) the supplication of the Philippians (τῆς ὑμῶν δεήσεως), to which the Apostle attaches great value (Philem. 22; Rom. xv. 30, 31; 2 Cor. i. 11): secondly, through the assistance of the Spirit of Jesus Christ (καὶ ἐπιχορηγίας τοῦ πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), which therefore the Holy Spirit affords, who is indeed the Spirit of Jesus Christ, directs His cause, and hence is designated as His Spirit. The genitive makes it unnecessary to repeat the article (τῆς), as also the close connection of the two substantives makes it unnecessary to repeat διά. On ἐπιχορηγία see Eph. iv. 16; comp. Rom. viii. 9, 10; Gal. iv. 6, 7. *Precationem in cœlum ascendentem, exhibitionem de cœlo venientem* (BENGEL). Hence it is wrong to regard καί as epexegetical, and ἐπιχορηγία as the contents of δέησις (MEYER); nor can τοῦ πνεύματος be shown to be *gen. obj.* from Gal. iii. 5. [Yet the close connection of the nouns indicates that the gifts and guidance of the Spirit were among the favors for which they prayed in his behalf.—H.]

Ver. 20.—**According to my earnest expectation and hope** (κατὰ τὴν ἀποκαραδοκίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα μου). Having stated the end or result (εἰς σωτηρίαν), and the means (διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν δεήσεως), he now presents the measure (κατά) of the ἀποβήσεται. The first substantive (ἀποκαραδοκία, see Rom. viii. 19) denotes the soul's subjective, intenser longing (ἀποκαραδοκέω, *erecto capite specto*); the second (ἐλπίς) the more objective, outward, ground or object of expectation.—The object of this longing and expectation is: **That in nothing I shall be ashamed** (ὅτι ἐν οὐδενὶ αἰσχυνθήσομαι). Ὅτι is declarative, not argumentative (ESTIUS); for οἶδα γάρ brings forward the reason of his rejoicing. Αἰσχύνεσθαι=בּוֹשׁ (Ps. xxxiv. 4, 29; Rom. ix. 33; 2 Cor. x. 8) is *to become ashamed*, to fail of one's purpose, be disappointed. The meaning is not *pudore confusus ab officio deflectam* (VAN HENGEL), since, as MEYER well observes, it relates not so much to the conduct as to the fate of Paul. Still less does it refer to an ignominious issue of his trial. Ἐν οὐδενί excludes the being put to shame in any particular, as ἐν μηδενί in ver. 28. It is incorrect to regard it as masculine, and to apply it to his opponents (HÖLEMANN, LIGHTFOOT), especially as the case is one not of individuals, but of parties.—**But** (ἀλλ') joins the positive side to the negative.—**That with all boldness as constantly, so now also Christ shall be magnified in my body** (ἐν πάσῃ παῤῥησίᾳ ὡς πάντοτε καὶ νῦν μεγαλυνθήσεται ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν τῷ σώματί μου). *Ignominiam a sese removet; sibi parrhesiam, Christo ipsi gloriam tribuit* (BENGEL). In the person of the Apostle who is in bonds Christ is to be thus glorified. This positive statement shows fully what is meant by the preceding negative statement. Παῤῥησία is not=joyfulness, for see I John ii. 28, where σχῶμεν παῤῥησίαν is opposed to καὶ μὴ αἰσχυνθῶμεν, as here. Ἐν πάσῃ corresponds to ἐν οὐδενί, and the μεγαλύνεσθαι of Christ in Paul's person, to Paul's αἰσχύνεσθαι designed and sought by his enemies. As formerly this had been done in many a difficult position, amid great obstacles, so also now in this severest crisis (καὶ νῦν) will Christ be glorified in him. He desires for himself what he entreats for the church (see ver. 11). On μεγαλυνθήσεται comp. Luke i. 46; Acts x. 46. This exaltation of Christ is effected as much indeed through Paul's activity and boldness (ἐν πάσῃ παῤῥησίᾳ), in word and deed, before individuals and crowds, friends and foes, as through his sufferings (hence ἐν τῷ σώματί μου instead of ἐν ἐμοί). It is not, therefore, the παῤῥησία of the teachers (vers. 15–18) (HÖLEMANN), nor does the verb (contrary to usage) refer to the growth of Christ in Paul (RILLIET), which surely does not take place in Paul's body. [He says ἐν τῷ σώματί μου, not ἐν ἐμοί, because he is thinking of the possibility of a violent death.—H.]—Both clauses: **Whether by life or by death** (εἴτε διὰ ζωῆς εἴτε διὰ θανάτου) are conditioned by ἐν τῷ σώματί μου. The meaning is, that whether he is to live or suffer death, the result will be for the glory of Christ. In the first case, by the Apostle's activity; in the second, by his joyful death. In either case, his παῤῥησία or 'boldness' would be made manifest. [The manner, therefore, in which the Apostle's trials, his perplexities and annoyances (τοῦτο, ver. 19) might be made to conduce to his salvation (εἰς σωτηρίαν) is evident. If, on the one hand, they should discourage him and lead him to relax his efforts, and render him unfaithful, they would endanger his hopes and safety, or at all events dim the lustre of his crown of glory in the heavenly world. So, on the other hand, if, through the prayers of his friends and the assistance of the Holy Spirit, these same trials should be overruled (as he was confident they would be) so as to strengthen in him the graces of the Christian and excite him to greater fortitude and zeal as a preacher of the gospel, they would then render the fact of his salvation more certain, and in the measure of its fullness more complete and glorious.

And it was not a vain confidence which the Apostle has expressed here. At a later period, on the eve of his actual martyrdom, he was enabled to exclaim: "I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing" (2 Tim. iv. 6, 7).—H.]

Ver. 21. [The Apostle is uncertain whether in a personal point of view he should choose to live or to die (vers. 21-24).—H.]—**For to me to live (is) Christ, and to die (is) gain.**—'Εμοὶ γάρ introduces a confirmation of the thought that it is entirely the same to him whether Christ be glorified through his life and activity, or by his death; with others (hence *ἐμοί* at the beginning) it may indeed be different. Τὸ ζῆν, which is made more specific by *ἐν σαρκί*, ver. 22, defines the nature of the preceding *ζωή*: this is *Χριστός* (predicate). *Quidquid vivo* (*vita naturali*), *Christum vivo*, *Christi causam, dum vitam in mundo ago, meam esse censeo* (Bengel). [Living consists only in union with and devotion to Christ: my whole being and activities are His. The context shows that *Χριστός*, besides the idea of union with Him, must also involve that of devotion to His service (Ellicott).—H.] *Καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος* imports: If the imprisonment end with my being condemned to death, even this as regards my person is also gain, as more fully explained in ver. 23. Hence the inf. aorist is used to mark the simple fact, while *ζῆν* is a continuative present. It is incorrect to understand *ζῆν* of the spiritual life (Rilliett), or to make *Χριστός* the subject in the sense of preaching Christ, *κέρδος* the predicate, and *τὸ ζῆν καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν* as accusative relations, *tamen vita, quam in morte* (Calvin, *et al.*). It is also wrong to make it parenthetic: His assurance that death will be gain will give him strength to die joyfully, and so he will glorify Christ (Meyer, *et al.*). [Since *κέρδος* is defined as *σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι* in ver. 23, 'the gain' cannot be a result viewed simply as advantageous to the cause of Christ or the salvation of others.—H.]

Ver. 22. **But if the living in the flesh, this (is) the fruit of my labor.**—*Εἰ δέ* begins the comparison of two cases. *Εἰ* pre-supposes an undoubted fact, in opposition (*δέ*) to the last thought (*τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος*). Τὸ ζῆν is more fully defined by *ἐν σαρκί*, because there is a life out of the flesh which *ἀποθανεῖν* calls to mind. *Τοῦτο* rhetorically brings the two antecedent words together, and *μοί*, *for me*, is placed emphatically before the predicate without the copula (*ἐστί*): *καρπὸς ἔργου*. In *καρπός* we have a parallel to *κέρδος* (ver. 21), and *τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκί* is thus also a gain, a living, ever ripening fruit, the nature of which the *genit.* of apposition more closely defines, like *flumen Rheni*, *virtus liberalitatis* (Bengel), and comp. Eph. i. 14; vi. 14, 16 f.; Col. ii. 24. See Winer's *Gram.* p. 531. So that Paul *ipsum opus pro fructu habet, alius ex opere fructum quærit* (Bengel). Ἔργον is the Apostolic activity. It is wrong to regard *εἰ*=*an* (Beza) [*whether* (Lightfoot)]; *τοῦτο ἔργον* as the apodosis=*this is fruit, etc.* (Pelagius, Bengel, A. V.); *καρπὸς ἔργου*=*operæ pretium* (Grotius); or to suppose an *aposiopesis: non repugno, non ægre fero* (Conr. Mueller, Rilliet). Hölemann translates against the context and the language: If to live is a fruit, in the flesh, death is a fruit indeed. [Instead of *ἔργου* as *genit.* of apposition, we prefer that of origin or source: *If the living in the flesh* (*εἰ*, not hypothetical, but syllogistic=since it is, *etc.*) *this* (which simply repeats and emphasizes *τὸ ζῆν*) is (brings forth, secures) *fruit*, *i. e.*, the salvation of men, *from work* (his continued Apostolic activity; comp. ii. 30; 1 Thess. v. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 5), *also then, etc.* (as in the next clause). With this modification the explanation of Dr. Braune as above agrees essentially with that of De Wette, Meyer, Ellicott, Alford, and many other interpreters.—H.]—**Then also what** (*i. e.*, **which of the two**) **I should choose I know not** (*καὶ τὸ αἱρήσομαι, οὐ γνωρίζω*). To the supposition *τὸ ζῆν—καρπός* Paul now adds *also* or *then* (*καί*) the uncertainty of the choice to be made (*οὐ γνωρίζω*). For this use of *καί* comp. 2 Cor. ii. 2. It is not a Hebraistic form of the apodosis. [Tischendorf has correctly only a comma after *ἔργου*. In this concomitant use of *καί*, as we may term it, its proper force is not wholly lost. It implies that if one theory be true, then another will be true also: if the life be thus useful, the choice must *also* (*καί*) be difficult. See Ellicott *in loc.*—H.] On *τί αἱρήσομαι*, see Winer's *Gram.* p. 229. It is a future with the force of the conjunctive, the two being closely related; and *τί* is for *πότερον*, as in Matth. xxi. 31. See Winer's *Gram.* p. 169. The middle denotes the choosing for himself, with *γνωρίζω*=*non definio mihi* (Bengel). [In the first edition of his Commentary, Meyer renders 'I am uncertain,' but in the second and third editions he renders 'I do not make known,' 'give no decision.' The latter is the prevalent sense in the N. T.—H.]

Ver. 23. **For I am in a strait betwixt the two** (*συνέχομαι δὲ ἐκ τῶν δύο*).—The negative statement in *οὐ γνωρίζω* passes here to a positive statement in *συνέχομαι*, and the latter is made emphatic by its position and strengthened by *δέ*=rather. The verb means *to be held together*, to be pressed hard (2 Cor. v. 14; Luke viii. 45 (*συνέχουσί σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσι*), xii. 50), and is followed by the instrumental dative (Matth. iv. 24; Luke iv. 38; viii. 37; Acts xviii. 5; xxviii. 8). Here the preposition with the genitive (*ἐκ τῶν δύο*) marks the origin or source of his perplexity about the two conditions, *i. e.*, *ζῆν* and *ἀποθανεῖν* already mentioned. The sense of the verb (see above) is manifest from ver. 24. It cannot refer to outward affliction or anxiety.—**Having the desire to depart** (*τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι*).—Paul is in a strait or perplexity, since for himself he prefers death to life. The article marks the desire as the one which Paul feels, not one already mentioned (Hölemann), which is not the case. The prep. *εἰς* points out the direction; whereas the genit. *τοῦ* would represent death as the object of his desire. Paul is not wearied of life, but his thoughts pass beyond death as a transition, and fix upon that which is to follow. Death is conceived of under a similar figure, *viz.*, that of a journey (Matth. xxvi. 24, *ὑπάγειν*), that of a voyage (2 Tim. iv. 6, *solvere ancoram*), and also without a figure, as *decedere*

(Luke xii. 36, BENGEL).—**And to be with Christ**—καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι.—Comp. 2 Cor. v. 8 (ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς κύριον); Heb. xii. 22, 23; Acts vii. 59. The departure (ἀναλῦσαι) brings him into this higher life of fellowship with Christ. There is no thought here of an intermediate state.—**Which is far better**—πολλῷ γὰρ μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον.—The accumulation of comparatives (2 Cor. vii. 13; Mark vii. 36) indicates the strength of his desire. WINER's *Gram.* p. 240.

Ver. 24. **Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you**—Τὸ ἐπιμένειν δέ stands opposed to ἀναλῦσαι. Ἐν τῇ σαρκί has the article here in the correct text (not ἐν σαρκί, as in ver. 22); hence in *his flesh* as it now is. This remaining is more necessary (ἀναγκαιότερον) as distinguished from his departing (ἀναλῦσαι), which is better (κρεῖσσον), as far as relates to his own preference. But here a calm survey and consideration of the circumstances, a regard for the welfare of others, beloved ones, among whom are to be named especially those to whom he writes (δι' ὑμᾶς), decide the question. His Apostolic calling and his service to the church, which are of far greater importance to him than his own heart's desire, control his decision. It is incorrect to explain ἀναγκαιότερον=*præstat* (HEINRICHS), as "too necessary" (VAN HENGEL), or to consider the glory of Christ as the ground of his wish to live longer (CALVIN).

Ver. 25. **And having this confidence I know** (καὶ τοῦτο πεποιθὼς οἶδα). Τοῦτο points back to ἀναγκαιότερον, and indicates the ground of his confidence, and the perf. part. marks this confidence as one which he has had, and still entertains. We are not to join τοῦτο with οἶδα (ERASMUS, *et al.*) or to explain this last as *probabiliter sperare* (BEZA, VAN HENGEL, RILLIET). Comp. Philem. ver. 22. Though uncertain as to what he ought to choose for himself, yet he is quite sure that he will remain.—**That I shall abide and continue with you all.**—Ὅτι μενῶ is the opposite of ἀναλῦσαι. On μένειν comp. 1 Cor. xv. 6; John xxi. 22, 26. It is more fully explained by καὶ συμπαραμενῶ πᾶσιν ὑμῖν. Παραμένειν is to remain here, while σύν adds the idea of association with others (πᾶσιν ὑμῖν). This fellowship helps him to give up the more desired ἀναλῦσαι, especially as his remaining has its consequence and fruit, as well as the being with Christ (σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι).—**For your furtherance and joy of faith.**—This is explanatory of δι' ὑμᾶς (ver. 24). Εἰς states the purpose of Paul's remaining; it is twofold: their furtherance in the faith, and their joy in the faith, τὴν ὑμῶν προκοπὴν καὶ χαρὰν τῆς πίστεως. This is Paul's life—to preach Christ and to strengthen the faith of others. On προκοπή see ver. 12; 1 Tim. iv. 15. Nothing is here said of a favorable termination of his imprisonment (BEZA). It is also incorrect to assume a hendiadys: *in incrementum gaudii vestri, quod ob agnitum evangelium accepistis* (HEINRICHS); or to understand it of Paul's joy on account of the faith of the Philippians (ERASMUS), or to connect τῆς πίστεως only with χαράν (VAN HENGEL); for in this case the pronoun would need to be repeated with πίστεως.

Ver. 26. **That your rejoicing may be more abundant.**—Ἵνα states the final purpose of the subordinate one, expressed by εἰς; comp. vers. 9, 10, 11. Τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν is *significatio gaudii, affectus gaudii pleni* (BENGEL), glorying, as 1 Cor. v. 6. It is the natural result of the increase and joy of their faith (τὴν ὑμῶν προκοπὴν καὶ χαρὰν τῆς πίστεως), but it is not the object of them. Hence καύχημα is not *materies gloriandi* (MEYER), nor is it boasting against Judaizing teachers (FLATT), or Paul's glorying (CHRYSOSTOM). But this glorying, as well as faith, is to increase (περισσεύῃ) **in Christ Jesus** (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) as its sphere.—**In me** (ἐν ἐμοί) points to the Apostle's person and activity as the outward sphere of this glorying which admits of increase in Christ. Neither ἐν Χριστῷ (CALVIN), nor ἐν ἐμοί (FLATT), belongs to καύχημα. The idea expressed by ἐν ἐμοί is rendered still more definite by the statement of the means.—**Through my return to you** (διὰ τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς)—by which the faith of the Philippians shall be confirmed and their joy be increased. On πάλιν, which has here the force of an adjective, see 2 Cor. xi. 23. Paul is thinking of his release from imprisonment; but no safe conclusion can be drawn from this as to the fulfilment of this expectation.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The evil and sorrow of the world, as imprisonment, and death, become a trial, a cross, on which hang victory and a glorious issue, only then, when he who experiences them can say: "For me to live is Christ" (ἐμοὶ τὸ ζῆν Χριστός). Not the sorrow which men experience makes a bearer of the cross, with its power of attraction, the sign in which we conquer; but the Christian's disposition and behaviour in sorrow make the sorrow a cross. In this consists the true value of martyrdom, and not in the fact alone of suffering and dying. Like the cross of Christ, it must also be a necessity, imposed by the Father, from which we can withdraw only by a violation of conscience, and a refusal to deny self, and to seek our own and our neighbor's edification. See HARLESS, *Ethik*, § 39.

2. The Christian shows himself, in calamity, to be one who is not overpowered, vexed, swept away by sorrow, or engulfed by it, like one who toilsomely wades through deep water, but he compels it to yield him strength and joy, like the stars of heaven in the night, after he has conquered it and made it his attendant. He is not the object of weak compassion and pity, but of admiration and love, like a conquering hero. He is like a praying one who speaks to God; and as one to whom God speaks, is an object almost of religious veneration.

3. The blessing of the cross is seen in three respects—*a*) The suffering soul becomes free, more joyful, riper, stronger (ver. 19, εἰς σωτηρίαν, comp. 12, 18, 20, 21 sq.), since it becomes more closely united to the Lord, purified from what is earthly and mortal, more intimate with the Eternal Will, and more joyful in it. *b*) Men on every side, Christians (ver. 14), as well as heathen, even Prætorians (ver. 13; Matth. xxvii. 54; Mark xv. 39; Luke xxiii. 47), are improved and benefited; for the glory of the peaceful fruit of righteousness becomes better and better known, and the deep need of its possession is felt in the hearts of men. *c*) The gospel secures for itself a recog-

nition of its true character by preaching, which brings to view the person and his history (vers. 12, 20), for thus the adaptation of the gospel to the hearts and lives of men is seen and confessed.

4. Death, which, like imprisonment and the world's enmity, is an evil, becomes in the Apostle's view an insignificant event, which closes indeed the life upon earth, but changes not the essence, the life of the soul, only the place and form of its existence (ver. 21, *ἀποθανεῖν*; ver. 23, *ἀναλῦσαι*). To experience it is no merit, but to conquer it by faith and patience is a grace. Death leads the faithful from the misery of imprisonment to be more completely with Christ. In what way we pass through death into fellowship with Christ, is not said; and still less is there any indication here of an intermediate state. This agrees with the word of the Lord to the thief on the cross (Luke xxiii. 43), and with the teaching of the parable of the rich man (Luke xvi. 23), and still more significantly with the efficacy of Christ's death and resurrection in regard to the relations of life and death, in heaven and on earth (1 Cor. v. 1; Eph. iv. 8; comp. 2 Cor. v. 8; Acts vii. 58).

5. [Unless Paul believed that the death which released him from the trials of this life was to introduce him at once to the presence of Christ and a state of blessedness, we see no adequate reason for the struggle between his desire to depart and be with Christ, and his anxiety to labor still for the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom on earth. If he believed that he was to remain for an indefinite time without consciousness in the grave, his zeal for men's salvation and his contempt of personal dangers and trials in the pursuit of that object, would lead him to desire to live as long as possible, on account of the importance of his ministry to mankind. On the other hand, if we suppose him to have regarded his attainment of the joys and rewards of heaven as simultaneous with his departure from this world, we have then an adequate explanation of his perplexity (vers. 21–24). For other passages which seem to involve the same doctrine, see Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. v. 6, 7; and Rev. vi. 9.—H.]

6. The substance of Christian preaching is the person of Christ (vers. 15, 17, 18), as the exaltation of His person is the end of Christian life (ver. 20). This should be the preacher's testimony, his proclamation.

7. The difference in the teaching here consists not so much in the difference of the doctrine of Christ, as in the difference of disposition of the teachers towards Paul (vers. 15–18). The agreement in their teaching, which could scarcely fail to admit of certain variations, is of more account to him than their hostility to him. So much the more magnanimous is his joy in the doctrine which they hold in common.

8. That church fellowship (*τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν περισσεύῃ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*) should promote Christian fellowship is exemplified in the intercourse of Paul and the Philippians (*ἐν ἐμοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, ver. 26). It is important to observe and maintain this connection.

9. The minister of Christ is helped and served in two ways—(*a*) by the assistance of the Holy Spirit, which is the Spirit of Christ; and (*b*) by the supplications of the church: thus from above and from below. He needs the supplications of the church of Christ not less than the church needs his testimony. The protection of praying hands is no insignificant one.

10. Observe the moral greatness of the Apostle! In the constraint of a prison, in the face of death, amid the enmities of some of his associates, he exults for joy in his fellowship with Christ, and allows it to suffer no abatement on account of an error. He hopes to be able to return again to the Philippians, free from his bonds (ver. 26), as shortly before he had expressed a similar hope to Philemon (Philem. ver. 22). This hope indeed he afterwards gave up (2 Tim. iv. 6), and four years before this had declared that he should not see again the Ephesians (Acts xx. 22–25). In this uncertainty his official gift remains intact, which, as a prophetical endowment, has to do with God's word, not with times and seasons (Acts i. 7). He does not, however, declare definitely (ver. 27) that he will come, but leaves it to God's disposal.*

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

For ministers, three teachings: 1) See that thou overcomest sorrow, and that thou art not overcome by it; 2) that Christ is praised thereby; 3) that the church by this very thing is advanced and built up in the faith.—Rejoice without envy in the preaching of thy worthy official brother. The word of God and the preaching of Christ should be to thee of too much value and importance to allow an unfriendly disposition to mortify or vex thee.—For the church, three teachings: 1) Take not offence at the greatness of the evil in the world, especially of the violent enmity which befalls thy pastor, but follow his deportment in the case; 2) persist in hearty supplication for him; 3) aid him full of confidence with thy testimony.—Only one thing must be regarded: that Christ alone, the Saviour of the world, be preached. Thou art not to judge the disposition of the preacher, but only the correctness of his preaching.—In general: Persecution or, at the utmost, death, is the greatest evil which the world can inflict upon the Christian, but this effects for him what launching does for a ship:—it brings him into his proper element. As the ship is thus sent forth upon the ocean for which it is designed, so is the Christian by this means brought to heaven, which is his home. To die, is but to come to our inheritance, if Christ is our life. From Him comes the unselfish love of life for others' sake, which is at once a joy in life and a joy in death, so that from our joy in death there comes no death to our joy. It is unchristian for one to wish for death because he is weary of life, or cowardly to fear death; and worse still are they who desire death while they fear it. Evil does not make us holy, death does not make us happy. Man does not become happy by dying, but the Christian dies, being happy.

IGNATIUS:—Let me become the prey of wild beasts, that God may become my possession. I

* [If Paul was imprisoned twice at Rome (as is almost certain), he could easily have fulfilled this hope of seeing again both the Philippians and Philemon, in the interval between his first and his second captivity. See *Commentary on Philemon* (LANGE's Series), pp. 6, 23.—H.]

am God's wheat; the teeth of the wild beasts will grind me so that I may become the purified bread of God. I shall become a true disciple of Jesus Christ when the world no longer sees my body. The iron and the cross, the breaking of the legs, the raging of the wild beasts, the mangling of the limbs, and the bruising of the body—all these diabolical torments may be exercised upon me if I but win Jesus Christ.

STARKE:—If God will make His children known, even His greatest enemies must lend their aid. Let God rule, and follow His leading.—Short but beautiful confession: Christ is our life in creation, in redemption, in regeneration, in the resurrection.

RIEGER:—For those in communion with God, in enjoyment of the life of Christ, dying is not the end; the soul's life from that point is before it, not behind (see ver. 21).

SCHLEIERMACHER:—The distressed and suffering man, be the cause of his suffering and distress what it may, attracts the earnest and anxious attention of men to himself more than all the royalty in the world. The way in which he bears his cross, the way in which he accepts his need and distress in his heavenly calling, excite the sympathy of men. If now we are all cross-bearers of our Lord, and if no one here below escapes from sorrows, then there is opened to us here at once a way in which we all, each according to his ability, may contribute to the advancement of the gospel, by bearing the troubles and adversities which the Lord sends, with patience and resignation to His will, with hope and trust in His imperishable work, with confidence and joyfulness of heart in His all-sufficient wisdom, in order that men may be thereby impelled to acknowledge and praise our heavenly Father.—Boldness on the one hand and faint-heartedness on the other, have, as it were, a diffusive and contagious power among men.—The troubles of this life will result in our highest good if we love God.—Above all things this is meet: 1) that we recognize the rough ways in which the Lord leads us as His ways, and acquiesce with our whole heart in His guidance; 2) that at the same time we look more to the internal than to the external; 3) the apostle adds, that it will turn to his salvation through the prayer of the church and through the supply of the spirit of Jesus Christ, which comes to him from the church.—This is the true happiness of the Christian, to which we should all aspire, that the longing for the greater glory which is reserved for us, shall never become so strong as to check or weaken our usefulness in the calling to which God has appointed us here on the earth.—If now we see the vineyard of the Lord so divided that to each one a task therein has been assigned, what else can we say in view of its present condition but that the vineyard is far from being wholly cultivated?—We must say then that all Christians, in whom the fear of death has been destroyed by a living and blessed fellowship with the Redeemer who has taken away the power of death, are able to withstand more firmly the assaults of earthly evil, and that their love for the perishable things of the world and enjoyment in them constantly diminish. The more this actually takes place, the more does there arise in them, even here upon earth, a higher love, a love for the Redeemer and His heavenly kingdom, in the strength of which they can regard themselves as servants of the Lord, as laborers in His vineyard, whose constantly renewed wish is, to bring forth fruit for Him unto whom all fruit belongs, as a reward for His sorrows and as a glorification of His victory.

HEUBNER:—Man often comes for the first time to know his strength when he is in misfortune.—When a friend of the truth is bound, ten others arise in his place.—The very best deeds may be done from impure motives; even Christ may be preached from ambition.—Spiritual envy and pride creep in even among preachers of the gospel, and incite them to a false and envious emulation.—When the friends of the truth are imprisoned, we ought to undertake their task, and to make good their places, that the good work may suffer no hindrance. The kindest service which can be rendered to noble martyrs in bonds, is to interest one's self in their cause, not in their person. The work is of more importance than the instrument.—The Christian commits himself wholly to God, and ought with reference to life and death to be absolutely resigned to His will. If he hopes in any respect to be useful to others, then he remains here even gladly.—WHITEFIELD once asked TENNANT, a preacher who was his friend, whether the thought that he might soon be called home, gave him joy. TENNANT replied: "I have no desire about it; my death does not concern me, my duty is to live as long as I can, as well as I can, and to serve my Master as faithfully as I can, until He calls me away. If I had sent my servant to plough, and should afterwards find him asleep, and he should say to me: 'Alas, the sun is so hot, let me go to the house!' might I not say to him, 'thou sluggard!'?"

PASSAVANT:—In steadfastness of faith the man of God holds fast joy in the faith. How little inclined we are by nature to leave this world for another better world in order to be with God, every candid mind willingly confesses to itself, and this fact holds up before us the clear mirror of our natural life, and shows us how far estranged we are from God, from His love, and the blessed life which is in Him.

NITZSCH:—How gloriously do desire for death and love of life unite in the Christian's mind! 1) The Christian shows by his faith that in death he loses nothing of that in and for which he here lives, but gains it. 2) Though it is better for him to be with Christ, yet it seems more necessary to remain in the flesh and bring forth fruit. 3) Whatever contradiction remains in his desires, he leaves God to settle, and will not choose or decide for himself.

[REV. J. TRAPP:—Two things make a good Christian, good actions and good aims. Though a good aim doth not make a bad action good, as we see in Uzzah, yet a bad aim makes a good action bad, as in these preachers (see ver. 15).—St. Paul stood, as it were, on tiptoes (*ἀποκαραδοκία*), to see which way he might best glorify God, by life or death (ver. 20)—Far, far the better (*πολλῷ μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον*, ver. 23), a transcendent expression, like Paul's *καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολήν*, 2 Cor. iv. 17.—H.]

[ROBERT HALL:—Paul was so intent upon the

advancement of truth, that he overlooked the malignity of the intention in the success of the cause. It is thus, my brethren, that religion lifts us above self-love and party-strife, and leads us to rejoice in every opening prospect of prosperity, and of good to others, in all public events and in every denomination (see ver. 15).—We see that with all his attainments the apostle was not lifted above them when he says, "by your prayers" (ver. 19). How much have we need to say, "Brethren, pray for us." The prayer of the obscurest Christian may procure and infuse among us the Spirit of God beyond what we could wish ourselves; for with Him all distinctions are lost but piety and necessity.—"To be with Christ," was the apostle's view of the heavenly world (ver. 23). He knew that Jesus Christ had promised that where He was there also His servants should be (John xvii. 24). He values the friendship of Christ above all the world,—to be found in His image and to be with Him, he can conceive of nothing higher.—If your attachment to this world be great, it must be cured by giving yourselves up more entirely to your Lord and Master.—H.]

SECTION III.

The Lord's Example and Pattern for the Observance of the Church.

CHAPTER I. 27—II. 18.

(1) *A true Christian deportment the condition of the Apostle's joy in the Church* (i. 27–30).

Characteristics of a Christian walk (vers. 27, 28 *a*); and the incentives to such a walk (vers. 28 *b*, 30).

27 Only let your conversation [deportment] be as it becometh the gospel of Christ:
that whether I come and see you or (*else*) be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that
ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the
28 gospel; and in nothing terrified by your adversaries, which is[1] to them an evident
29 token of perdition, but to you of salvation, and that of God. For unto you it is
[was] given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer
30 for his sake [in his behalf]; having the same conflict which ye saw[2] in me and now
hear to be in me.

[1] Ver. 28.—[The received text has μέν before ἐστιν, interpolated to respond to δέ in the next clause; and probably for a similar reason ὑμῶν was changed to ἡμῖν (MEYER, ALFORD, LIGHTFOOT). ELLICOTT would retain ἡμῖν.—H.]

[2] Ver. 30.—[The T. R. has ἴδετε after a few copies, but the correct word is undoubtedly εἴδετε. The itacism, or similar pronunciation, of the first syllable (an error of the ear in dictation) led to the interchange.—H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 27. **Only let your deportment be as it becometh the gospel of Christ.** Μόνον in this emphatic position marks the true Christian walk as the sole, indispensable condition of Paul's joy, when he should come to them, as the connection with vers. 24-26 shows. (Gal. ii. 10; v. 13). BENGEL: *hoc unum curate, nil aliud.* But this one requisition contains within itself manifold other requisitions. The verb here (*πολιτεύεσθε*) is taken from political life. The church at Philippi forms a part of the kingdom of God, of which they should prove themselves citizens. Paul uses the word elsewhere only in Acts xxiii. 1 (*πεπολίτευμαι*), in his speech before the Jewish Council, where in the presence of the civil rulers he feels himself to be but a member of the common body politic. Περιπατεῖν refers more to individual life; this verb to church-life, corresponding to *πάντες* (vers. 4, 7, 8). The fundamental law of this kingdom is denoted by *τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and the corresponding deportment by *ἀξίως*. (Col. i. 10: *ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου*; Eph. iv. 1: *ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι τῆς κλήσεως*).—**That** (*ἵνα*) states the aim or object of his exhortation, agreeably to the context (ver. 26).—**Whether I come and see you or be absent** (*εἴτε ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν ὑμᾶς, εἴτε ἀπών*). He thus leaves it uncertain how it may be, but in accordance with his hopeful desire, puts the supposition of his coming first. In both cases he presupposes his release, which might indeed lead him not to Philippi, but elsewhere.—**I may hear** (*ἀκούσω*), includes both cases, *i. e.* either from their own mouth, or from others (MEYER). BENGEL: *audiam et cognoscam.* The object is: **your affairs** (*τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν*), and this as more fully explained: **that ye stand fast in one spirit** (*ὅτι στήκετε ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι*), which is the subject of Paul's great anxiety. Comp. *οἶδά σε τίς εἶ*,

Luke iv. 34; xix. 3; Mark i 24. See WINER's *Gramm.* p. 626. HÖLEMANN incorrectly joins ἵνα with στήκετε, as if it were ἀκούσας, and ὅτι simply repeated ἵνα. The construction would be confused, harsh (*hiulca*, CALVIN terms it), and the participles would be nominative absolute. The verb (iv. 1; 1 Cor. xvi. 13; Gal. v. 1; 1 Thess. iii. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 15) means to *keep one's ground in battle.* What is meant evidently is that the Philippians should cherish a spirit of unity among themselves, as in I Cor. iv. 21; xii. 13; 1 Pet. iii. 4. It is presupposed that this harmony, which is to be an object of such earnest endeavor, is a gift of the Holy Spirit (Eph. iv. 3, 4), but the Holy Spirit is not directly intended (VAN HENGEL).—**With one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel** (*μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.* This explains more fully *στήκετε ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι*. Here we evidently have to do with a struggle in which the main object is unity, and hence *μιᾷ ψυχῇ* stands with emphasis at the beginning. The *πνεῦμα* which is in the *ψυχή*, is that part of our nature which is the sphere (*ἐν*) of the unity. The dative *ψυχῇ* is the instrumental dative. The substantive *ψυχή* denotes that part of our being which is connected above with *πνεῦμα* and below with *σάρξ*, and constitutes the centre of man's peculiar pe sonality.—individuality. Hence, *μιᾷ ψυχῇ* presents their outward manifestation.—Comp. ii. 2; Acts iv. 32, (DELITZSCH, *Psychologie*, p. 199 ff.). Repellent peculiarities may exist even where there is an agreement in principle. BENGEL: *est interdum inter sanctos naturalis aliqua antipathia.* The dative *τῇ πίστει*, *for the faith*, presents the object of the struggle, which the genitive *τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* renders more precise, and so guards it from any arbitrary misconception of friends or foes. The preposition in *συναθλοῦντες* refers to this co-operation of the Philippians with Paul (Col. ii. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7). Comp. vers. 7, 30; iv. 3, where *μοί* indicates what is here sufficiently plain from the connection. It is incorrect to limit *σύν* only to the unity of the Philippians among themselves (WIESINGER), which *μιᾷ ψυχῇ* after *ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι* has already pointed out, or to exclude this reference (MEYER), or to make *σύν* govern *πίστει* (GROTIUS). *Τῇ πίστει* is not an instrumental dative (CALVIN, *et al.*), nor should *μιᾷ ψυχῇ* be connected with *στήκετε* (CHRYSOSTOM, LUTHER).

Ver. 28. **And in nothing terrified** (*μὴ πτυρόμενοι ἐν μηδενί*). *Καί* adds another concomitant of *στήκετε*. The verb (properly used of horses in the race) means to *turn about*, to *start*, *spring aside.* Comp. ver. 20; 2 Cor. vi. 3.—**By your adversaries** (*ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντικειμένων*) gives the cause of this agitation or panic. We are to understand this of their personal enemies (comp. ver. 30), unchristian opposers of the gospel, especially among the Jews, but also among the heathen (ver. 30, *etc.;* Acts xvi. 11 sq.; xvii. 5 sq). —The Apostle proceeds to enforce his exhortation by appropriate motives, vers. 28 *b*–30.—**Which to them is an evident token of perdition** (*ἥτις ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἔνδειξις ἀπωλείας*). The argumentative *ἥτις* = *since it is* (Eph. iii. 13), in sense points back to the thought that the church does not allow itself to be terrified, but grammatically connects itself by a familiar attraction with *ἔνδειξις* (1 Tim. iii. 15). See WINER's *Gramm.*, p. 627. The emphatic position of *ἐστίν* shows that even if they (*οἱ ἀντικείμενοι*) do not perceive it, or in their excitement do not acknowledge it, yet the fact that the church is unterrified is an evidence (comp. Rom. iii. 25; 2 Cor. viii. 24) of their destruction, of their exclusion from the blessed kingdom of God (1 Cor. i. 18). Comp. 2 Thess. i. 5-10.—**But to you of salvation** (*ὑμῖν δὲ σωτηρίας*). Comp. Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 12. For the reading see on the text. That which *should* awaken the fears of others with regard to their final destiny, even if it does not, is to believers a pledge of salvation.—**And that of God.** *Καὶ τοῦτο* refers equally to both clauses; for the disquietude of the adversaries before the bar of conscieuce, and the calmness of believers, alike come from God (*ἀπὸ θεοῦ*). Punishment and consolation are both from Him! To limit *τοῦτο* in the second member (CALVIN, *et al.*), to understand it of humility (HÖLEMANN), or to connect it with what follows (RILLIET), is incorrect.

Ver. 29. **For unto you it was given** (*ὅτι ὑμῖν ἐχαρίσθη*) confirms the statement in ver. 28, the last words of which (*ἀπὸ θεοῦ*) led the Apostle to adopt the passive form here. It is just you who are struggling and suffering together, to whom this grace [or undeserved favor] has been granted by God. Hence *ὑμῖν* has the emphatic position. BENGEL emphasizes the verb (*gratiæ munus signum salutis*), but without reason, while MEYER limits the confirmation to *τοῦτο ἀπὸ θεοῦ*. —**In the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer in his behalf** (*τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, οὐ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν*). This clause forms the subject of *ἐχαρίσθη*. At first *τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ πάσχειν* was the thought in Paul's mind (which expresses positively what is stated negatively in *μὴ πτυρόμενοι*); but the condition under which the suffering leads to salvation (*σωτηρία*) occurs to the writer's mind, and he interpolates the clause *οὐ μόνον . . . . πιστεύειν* in the middle of the sentence, but afterwards resumes his first thought in *τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ*. The faith which works such steadfast endurance of suffering clearly proves that both are from God. *Τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ* is not = what concerns Christ (BEZA, *et al.*).

Ver. 30. **Having the same conflict** (*τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγῶνα ἔχοντες*) presents the characteristic of this suffering, the participle agreeing with the subject understood with *πάσχειν*, as in Eph. iv. 2; iii. 17, 18; and Col. iii. 10. See WINER's *Gramm.*, p. 572. It should not be connected with *στήκετε* (BENGEL), or be referred back to *ὑμῖν* for its subject (MEYER).—*Τὸν αὐτόν* is explained by what follows: **Which ye saw in me and now hear to be in me** (*οἷον εἴδετε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ νῦν ἀκούετε ἐν ἐμοί*). He refers in the first verb to his sojourn at Philippi (Acts xvi. 12-16 sq.), and in *νῦν ἀκούετε* to the information contained in the present letter (which would be read before them) and to that furnished by the report of Epaphroditus (ii. 28). *Ἐν ἐμοί*, **in me**, in both instances refers to a conflict which Paul suffers, to persecutions directed against himself. The Philippians also endured the same; and it is the kind of conflict which is the same in each case. The likeness does not consist merely in

the similar ground of the conflict, that is in the faith for which they suffer (MEYER). The second ἐν ἐμοί is not = *de me* (Vulg., ERASMUS, *et al.*), nor is allusion made here to false teachers (HEINRICHS).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. A right deportment of the Christian is the one thing which the Apostle demands of each member of the church. It is only this one thing, because this embraces all that belongs to the special circumstances, positions, and relations of life; just this alone, because it is the deportment of a citizen of the kingdom of God, including the relations of each one with every other, and finds its rule in the fundamental law of the people of God, the Gospel of Christ, to which it must correspond (ver. 27).

2. Four points here deserve especial attention. (*a*) The calling of the Christian is that of a warrior who retreats not; (*b*) It requires him to hold together and to agree together with the church; (*c*) It requires him to keep ever in view the object of the contest, his faith; and (*d*) It secures to him, in all outward afflictions, true soul-peace. In the first respect, it is not something to be won, but is a prize which having been won, the Christian is to defend; not salvation to be gained, but a possession to be kept. In the second respect, it is unity with the Apostle and with each member of the church, in the direction and impulse of the Spirit, in opposition to unchristian opponents. But the individual peculiarities of temperament, education, *etc.*, are not to be made an occasion for separation. In the third respect, it is the holding fast of the faith which is according to the gospel; and in the fourth respect, it is the keeping watch over the soul in order that by looking to the example of the Apostle and of the Lord Himself, we may be kept from fear and despair by reason of the adversaries.

3. The intrepidity of the Christian amid the enmities of unchristian opponents, is as certainly an evidence to him of fellowship with God, as it is for them a proof that they should and may learn therein their exposure to final destruction (ver. 28).

4. He who believes in Christ must regard it as a grace of God that he is permitted to suffer for Him (ver. 29).

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Compare the Doctrinal and Ethical remarks.

STARKE:—Brief epitome of the whole of Christianity: faith, love, patience.

RIEGER:—Although we must suffer and struggle together for the gospel, yet we often become thereby more completely linked together. Since the disposition to yield to fear is planted so deeply in our nature, it becomes a part of the renewal of our souls into the image of God, to obtain again a steadfast courage to adhere to the right.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—Fearlessness with respect to all adversaries of the kingdom of God and all their efforts against it, must be peculiar to the Christian; for it has no other basis or other measure in him than his faith in the Redeemer and his love for Him and for His holy cause.

HEUBNER:—To believe in Christ is to make common cause with Him, hence also to suffer with Him.

PASSAVANT:—Whenever Christians fall out with one another, it happens for the most part because they are unwilling to surrender their own self-will to the control of the one Spirit of the Lord, or to merge their individuality in His sovereignty.

[ROBERT HALL:—"Nothing terrified by your adversaries" (ver. 28). Having Jesus Christ present with the Father, as an advocate, what was there to terrify them? They knew that He was at the head of all—principalities and powers, thrones and dominions, being made subject to Him. That Christian, my brethren, who views Jesus Christ as the Lord of men, of angels, and of glory, how firm and undaunted may he look around him, and consider kings and princes but as common dust; for they must submit themselves to His authority or perish. See Ps. ii. 10-12.—H.]

---

(2) *Christ's Example on the Way through Humiliation to Exaltation* (ii. 1-11).

After earnestly and eloquently entreating them to stand together in harmony (1-4), he holds up to view the person of the Redeemer (5, 6), His state of Humiliation (7, 8), and His state of exaltation (9-11).

1 If there be therefore any consolation [exhortation] in Christ, if any comfort
of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any[1] bowels and mercies [compassion],
2 fulfil ye [make full] my joy, that ye be like-minded [mind the same thing], having
the same love, being of one accord, of one mind [with one soul minding the one
3 thing]. Let nothing be done through strife or vain glory; but in lowliness of
4 mind let each esteem other [others] better than [superior to] themselves. Look
not every man[2] on his own things, but every man also on the things of others.
5, 6 Let this mind[3] be in you which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form

7 of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no re-
putation [emptied or divested himself], and took upon him the form of a servant,
8 and was made in the likeness of men. And being found in fashion as a man, he
humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.
9 Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a [the[4]] name which is
10 above every name; that at [in] the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of
things [beings] in heaven, and things [beings] in earth, and things [beings] under
11 the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the
glory of God the Father.

[1] Ver. 1.—*εἰ τις σπλάγχνα* is found in ℵ A B C D E F K L. It is either a solecism (TISCHENDORF N. T. *ed.* VII. *maj.*) or a mistake (WINER, *et al.*) of Paul or of the transcribers for *τινα*. [WORDSWORTH makes here the just remark (in opposition to a possible extreme): "But this text, among others, affords evidence that it is not a sound principle of criticism, to limit the data for determining the readings of the N. T. to the most ancient extant MSS., and that it is necessary to extend the range of inquiry to the cursive MSS. and other collateral aids."—H.]

[2] Ver. 4—*ἕκαστοι* has stronger support in A B F G, *et al.*, than *ἕκαστος* in ℵ C D E, *et al.*

[3] Ver. 5.—*τοῦτο γὰρ φρονεῖτε* is found in D E F G; *γάρ* is wanting in ℵ A B C, probably because *ἕκαστοι* was added from ver. 4. ["As ver. 5 begins an ecclesiastical lecture, and as the explanative force of *γάρ* (= 'verily,' 'as the case stands') might not have been fully understood and have led to the omission of the particle, the reading *γάρ* seems slightly more probable" (ELLICOTT).—H.] ℵ A B C* read *φρονεῖτε*, others read *φρονείσθω* [The former is also grammatically the more difficult, and therefore more likely to be original.—H.]

[4] Ver. 9.—*τὸ ὄνομα* in ℵ A B C; the article is omitted in D E F G, *et al.*

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **If there be therefore any exhortation in Christ** (*εἴ τις οὖν παράκλησις ἐν Χριστῷ*). *Οὖν* goes back to the preceding thought (i. 27-30). He now exhorts them to be united in the present conflict, in which they as well as himself are engaged, that the joy which he has felt on account of their harmony may receive no check. *Εἰ* presents what is actual as hypothetical for the sake of the conclusion, as in Eph. iii. 2, 4, 21; Col. i. 23; ii. 20; iii. 1. We are to supply *ἐστί*, but not also *ἐν ὑμῖν* (MEYER). It is to be taken for granted that such exhortation (*παράκλησις*), which by *ἐν Χριστῷ* (i. 26) is defined as based upon Christ, as having its sphere or element in Him, is found richly in the Apostle; but he adopts this mode of expression in his humility. Comp. Rom. xv. 30. [The A. V. renders *παράκλησις consolation*, but that sense destroys the difference between this clause and the next. The meaning here is: If those who are in Christ may address to each other exhortations and entreaties with a right to expect that they will not be unavailing, then *fulfil, etc.* We may carry forward the idea of *ἐν Χριστῷ* to the other clause —H.]—**If any comfort of love** (*εἴτι παραμύθιον ἀγάπης*). According to 1 Thess. ii. 11: *ὡς πατὴρ τέκνα ἑαυτοῦ παρακαλοῦντες ὑμᾶς καὶ παραμυθούμενοι*; and 1 Cor. xiv. 3: *παράκλησιν καὶ παραμυθίαν*, this *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* must denote *consolation of love*, friendly address, or encouragement which springs from love, as described by the genitive. We are to refer the above without doubt to the Apostle. [The Apostle would say: If it be a characteristic of true love that it is ever ready to comfort or encourage those for whom it is cherished, then comply with my request and thus manifest your love to me.—H.] —**If any fellowship of spirit** [*or* **the Spirit**] (*εἴ τις κοινωνία πνεύματος*). The article being omitted, we cannot compare this expression with 2 Cor. xiii. 13: *κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, and explain it as fellowship with the Holy Spirit (BENGEL, MEYER); but the *κοινωνία*, which was described in i 5 with reference to its object or outward action, is described here in its inward sphere: *fellowship of spirit* among themselves, and with the Apostle, by virtue of which exhortation and entreaty readily find response and acceptance as addressed to each other. That this fellowship of spirit is a gift of the Holy Spirit, is only pre-supposed, not stated. [The absence of the article does not decide against the other view; for *πνεῦμα* as being of the nature of a proper name may have the article or omit it. See WINER'S *Gramm.*, p. 122. Most interpreters understand the Holy Spirit to be meant.—H.]—**If any bowels and compassion** (*εἴ τινα σπλάγχνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοί*). The first substantive (i. 8) denotes the seat, the source, of the second; the second being in the plural represents the individual proofs, the acts as repeated, manifold. See WINER'S *Gramm.*, p. 176; Col. iii. 12; *σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ, lect. var.* (*οἰκτιρμῶν*). Thus the fellowship or participation (*κοινωνία*) in the third clause appears in its action and effects. [The two nouns give intensity to the idea. The Apostle intimates in terms of the greatest delicacy that any reluctance to grant him the favor for which he so earnestly pleads, would have all the effect upon his feelings of unkindness and cruelty.—H.] The first two clauses we are to refer to Paul, the other two to the Philippians; the implied affirmation of the several conditions (*εἴ τις . . . . οἰκτιρμοί*), as respects both Paul and those addressed, enforces the exhortation (*πληρώσατε*) which they severally introduce. It is incorrect to regard the first and third as objective, and the second and fourth as subjective motives (MEYER), or to refer all four to the Philippians only (MEYER, SCHENKEL). That we are to supply *χαρά*, from ver. 2, in each of the conditional clauses ('*si quod* (gaudium) *consolatio amoris*,' *etc.*), according to BENGEL, is inadmissible.

Ver. 2. **Make full my joy** (*πληρώσατέ μου τὴν χαράν*). The Apostle has joy already, and it only remains that this should be full and complete (comp. i. 9; 1 John i. 4; 2 John 12). The Philippians are to make it so by allowing his appeal to prevail with them (first two clauses), and by maintaining and exhibiting the virtues to which he exhorts them (last two) —He sums up the whole as it were in one word: **That ye mind the same thing.** *Ἵνα* represents the harmony

of the Philippians (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε), as sought by them in order [as one of its attendant aims] to fill up the measure of Paul's joy. According to iii. 15; iv. 2; Rom. xii. 16; xv. 5, *minding and striving after* the same object are meant.—This is more closely defined, first on its ethical side: **Having the same love** (*τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην ἔχοντες*). As possessors and dispensers of that love which in its object, purity and strength, is essentially the same, they should be of one mind.—Secondly, the trait or conduct appearing on its intellectual side is: **Being of one accord** (A. V.), *or* **like-minded, pondering the one thing** (*σύμψυχοι τὸ ἓν φρονοῦντες*). With reference to the object had in view, the τὸ αὐτό represents it as a single thing, and the question they consider is, what *one thing* is necessary; and further, the personal unity which corresponds to this unity of aim, becomes prominent, as in i. 27: *μιᾷ ψυχῇ*. TITTMANN (*Syn.* I. p. 67) correctly observes: *ἰσόψυχος, est qui eodem modo est animatus* (like-minded); *σύμψυχος autem, qui idem sentit, unanimis* (harmonious); *σύμψυχοι esse possunt, qui non sunt ἰσόψυχοι; sunt igitur σύμψυχοι οἱ τὸ αὐτὸ φρονοῦντες. Sed τὸ ἓν φρονεῖν est unum velle, in uno expetendo consentire.* In this earnest exhortation the accumulation of terms and phrases cannot surprise us. It is incorrect to regard *σύμψυχοι* as independent, the subject of a separate predication (OECUMENIUS, *et al.*). To these two positive qualifications correspond the negative ones in ver. 3.

Ver. 3. **Let nothing be done through strife or vain glory.**—*Μηδὲν κατ' ἐριθείαν* forbids whatever is without or against *τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην*, while *μηδὲ κατὰ κενοδοξίαν* forbids whatever violates *τὸ ἓν φρονεῖν, μιᾷ ψυχῇ*. On the first substantive see in i. 17; on the second, SUIDAS: *ματαία τις περὶ ἑαυτοῦ οἴησις* (Gal. v. 26, *κενόδοξοι*); *κατά* denotes rule, motive (WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 401). Without question it is more simple to continue *φρονοῦντες* from the preceding verse (WINER, *Gram.*, p. 587) than to supply *ποιοῦντες* (ERASMUS, LUTHER, *et al.*), or even to construe it with the following *ἡγούμενοι* (HÖLEMANN).—The positive (ver. 2 *b*) is opposed here to the negative (ver. 3 *a*).—**But in lowliness of mind** (*or* **in humility**) **let each esteem others superior to themselves.**—'*Ἀλλά* marks strongly the opposition. The instrumental dative (*τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ*) corresponds to *κατά* with the accusative. See WINER'S *Gram.* p. 402, note 2. On the substantive see Eph. iv. 4; Col. ii. 18, 23; iii. 12. '*Ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν* teaches that humility fixes its eye on another's excellences, and judges him from this point of view. BENGEL: *Jure et dotibus fieri id potest, non extreme tantum, sed per veram ταπεινοφροσύνην, cum quis per abnegationem oculos avertit a suis prærogativis et alterius dotes, quibus prior est, studiose contemplatur.*

Ver. 4. **Look not every one on his own things, but every one also on the things of others** (*μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστοι σκοποῦντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἑτέρων ἕκαστοι*).—The sentence presents a general principle. The unusual plural *ἕκαστοι*, which is emphatic in each number, but especially in the second, where it stands at the end, indicates that this should be true of *every member* of the church. *Τὰ ἑαυτῶν, τὰ ἑτέρων*, signify in general *res, causa*, as in ii. 21; 1 Cor. xiii. 5 (*τὰ ἑαυτῶν*); x. 24 (*τὸ ἑαυτοῦ, τὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου*), 33 (*τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ, τὸ τῶν πολλῶν*), *τά* being used, and not *τό*, in order to mark the multiplicity. It is also to be noticed that *ἄλλος denotat alium, nulla diversitatis nisi numeri ratione, ἕτερος non tantum alium, sed etiam diversum indicat* (TITTMANN, *Syn.* I. p. 155 sq.). While in the above passages *ζητεῖν* is employed, we have here *σκοποῦντες* (iii. 17). Hence, according to the context, we are to think of the gifts and excellencies of others before our own, and of their advantage, interest, as well as our own. This distinction, however, comes out more clearly in view of what follows. '*Ἀλλὰ καί* after *μή* limits or softens the antithesis. We are to think *also* of the things of others, hence not merely and exclusively of them. It is selfishness only that is forbidden. ["We are to look," says LIGHTFOOT, "*beyond* our own interest to that of others."—H.] See WINER'S *Gram.* p. 498. It is incorrect to deny this distinction between *ζητεῖν* and *σκοπεῖν* so as either to find no reference to gifts and excellencies (MEYER), or to think exclusively of these (CALVIN).

Ver. 5. **Let this mind be in you**, or, according to the better text, **have this mind in you** (*τοῦτο γὰρ φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν*).—Paul confirms his exhortation to unity by showing what self-denying love and humility are, as illustrated in the example of Christ. *Τοῦτο* has as its correlative *ὃ* in the following clause, while *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* answers to *ἐν ὑμῖν*. Hence the meaning must be *in animis vestris*, but not *intra vestrum cœtum* (HÖLEMANN). [For the force of *γάρ* see notes on the text.—H.]—**Which was also in Christ Jesus** (*ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* sc. *ἐφρονήθη*). *Καί, also, i. e.*, as well as *ἐν ὑμῖν*.

Ver. 6. **Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.**—'*Ὃς* has for its antecedent *Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, and points to His antemundane state, as vers. 7, 8, refer to His earthly existence, and vers. 9–11 refer to His subsequent glorified condition. The subject is the *ego* of the Lord, which is active in all the three modes of existence. It is the entire summary of the history of Jesus, including His ante-human state (MEYER). Hence neither the *λόγος ἄσαρκος* alone, nor the *λόγος ἔνσαρκος*, is to be taken as the subject. The emphatic participial clause (*ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων*) connects itself with the principal clause (*οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ*), and the participle must be taken as imperfect, not as present (UMBREIT, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1828, p. 594). The finite verb *ἡγήσατο*, from its import, requires us to think of a resolution or decision to which what is stated in the participle stands related as concessive in accordance with the sense of the whole passage. (Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 9, *ἐπτώχευσε πλούσιος ὤν*); hence neither causal (RHEINWALD *et al.*) nor merely temporal (MEYER). If now we regard strictly the connection and drift of the context, which is to bring before us Christ's example, as a testimony in behalf of that humble self-denial which promotes harmony, and against the *ἐριθείαν* and *κενοδοξίαν* which destroy it, the meaning of this difficult passage cannot be mistaken. The words in themselves are plain. '*Ὑπάρχων*, stronger than *ὤν*, denotes Christ's pre-existence, *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ*. According to Mark xvi. 12 (*ἐφανερώθη ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ*), and in accordance with its use elsewhere,

μορφή must be understood of the outward form, "*species externa*," and this as defined by θεοῦ, which must be understood as not of the person of God, the Father, but only of the Godhead,—is a divine *morphe* or form, that of a God. Comp. iii. 21; Rom. viii. 29: σύμμορφον. The μορφὴ θεοῦ here corresponds to μορφὴν δούλου, ver. 7, as ὑπάρχων has its parallel in λαβών there. BENGEL well observes: *ipsa natura divina decorem habebat infinitum in se, etiam sine ulla creatura illum decorem intuente.* Comp. John v. 37: εἶδος αὐτοῦ (of God); xvii. 5: τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον παρά σοι; Col. i. 15: εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ; Hebr. i. 3: ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. It is incorrect to regard it as equivalent to φύσις, οὐσία (the Greeks, AUGUSTINE *et al.*), *status* (CALOV, *et al.*), and to hold that Jesus, when He was on earth, caused His δόξα to be recognized through the medium of His words and works (LUTHER, *et al.*), of His miracles (GROTIUS, *et al.*), and in the transfiguration (WETSTEIN). ["Though μορφή," says LIGHTFOOT, "is not the same as φύσις or οὐσία, yet the possession of the μορφή involves participation in the οὐσία also; for μορφή implies not the external accidents, but the essential attributes. Similar to this, though not so decisive, are the expressions used elsewhere of the Divinity of the Son: εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ, 2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15; and χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως—τοῦ θεοῦ, Heb. i. 3. Similar also is the term which St. John has adopted to express this truth—ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ." It may be added that the word is fitly chosen for the expression of the Apostle's idea. For though μορφή denotes properly the *outline* or *shape* of an object, and not directly the *substance* or *nature* of the object, it yet presupposes the existence of that *nature* or *reality*, of which it is the manifestation, just as the figure or shadow implies a body or substance which determines the figure or outline. Besides, to deny that Christ's μορφή or *form* as God, agreed with the reality, would oblige us to deny also in the next verse that His form or condition as a *servant* agreed with the reality, and this would destroy the force of the Apostle's reasoning. The condition in both cases presupposes the corresponding nature or reality, and is called μορφή precisely on account of that condition. The Apostle seems to have chosen this peculiar word because he would provide in his mode of speaking for the fact, that though the state or manifestation was changed, the nature or essence of the personality remained unchanged.—H.]—The expression οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο is more difficult. It denies a precedence of self, as is the case with those τὰ ἑαυτῶν σκοποῦντες (ver. 4). In its connection with ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, and its position before ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτόν, it points to a decision in a negative form before the incarnation. Hence it is not the same as οὐχ ἥρπασε, which did not for a moment enter into the thoughts of Christ. Ἁρπαγμός may, like πειρασμός, βαπτισμός, signify the *act* of robbery; and it would properly denote this according to the rules of derivation (WINER's *Gram.* p. 93); but usage allows it to be taken as *res rapta* or *rapienda* (BRUECKNER against MEYER); just as χρησμός may be *non vaticinatio sed vaticinium*, χρησματισμός *et negotiatio et id quod hac perpetratur*, so here also ἁρπαγμός= ἅρπαγμα (THOLUCK: *Pfingstprogramm*, 1847, pp. 17-19). Whether the meaning is *res rapta* or *rapienda*, the context must decide. Here now ἁρπαγμόν is predicate in its relation to τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ as the object (WINER's *Gram.* p. 323). On this construction καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται βιασταὶ ἁρπάζουσιν αὐτήν in Matt. xi. 12 is very instructive. Ἁρπάζειν is not a heroic *exspoliare*, but a violent appropriating to one's self, of which the object is τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ. This is therefore not "*spolium*," "*præda*," but "*res rapienda*." The emphasis falls here on εἶναι; ἴσα (not ἴσα—see WINER's *Gram.* p. 177) is an adverbializing accusative (BENGEL), but different from ἴσως, since it denotes several relations of likeness, and from ἴσος, since it does not point to a likeness of person, as John v. 18 (ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ), but to the equality of Christ's condition with that of God's. What is meant by this expression appears from vers. 10, 11: it is the κυριότης of the Lord, His worship in the church, in heaven, and upon earth. Hence the difference between ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων and τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ is that the former denotes the Lord's mode of existence, as a divine existence for Himself apart from the world and before it, the dignity of the Son, founded upon His eternal origin or generation from the Father, but the latter His existence as the King of His people in the realm of the Father, at His right hand. It is entirely like Eph. i. 20-23; John v. 22, 23; John xx. 28; Matt. xxviii. 18-20. Accordingly it must signify "*rapiendum non duxit*." For the former (μορφὴ θεοῦ) was His from eternity, while the latter (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ) He had not as yet obtained. He was already enjoying the former before He had received the latter. It is not correct to regard the object of ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο as identical with what is stated concessively in the participial clause (LUTHER, MEYER, *et al.*), or ἁρπαγμόν as equivalent to "*præda, res rapta*" (AMBROSIUS, *et al.*), "*spolia*" (ERASMUS, RHEINWALD, *et al.*), "*holding tenaciously*" (HÖLEMANN), "*concealing*" (MATTHIES), "*a triumphant display*" (LUTHER, *et al.*), nor are we to understand by εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ "*plenitudinem et altitudinem dei*" (BENGEL), "*vitam vitæ dei æqualem*" (VAN HENGEL), or "*identity with the Father*" (RILLIET). It is entirely fanciful to scent Gnostic allusions in ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ, ἴσα θεῷ εἶναι, ἁρπαγμός, as also in ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε and ἐν ὁμοιώματι, σχήματι εὑρεθείς (ver. 7), and in ἐπουρανίων, ἐπιγείων, καταχθονίων (ver. 10), (BAUR) as BRUECKNER shows (*Ep. ad Phil. Paulo auctori vindicata*, p. 15 ff.) in his *exposé* of the difference between the doctrine of the Gnostics and the present passage, and of the contradiction between BAUR's earlier and his later representation of this doctrine, and also ERNESTI (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1848, pp. 858-924; 1851, pp. 595-630), with admirable acuteness and learning. Yet the view advanced as a conjecture by UMBREIT (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1828, p. 595) and earnestly maintained by ERNESTI, that this passage is to be explained out of Gen. ii. 3, is unnecessary and untenable.

[The view of τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ (adopted above by Dr. BRAUNE) as = "the κυριότης, or worship of Christ in the church, in heaven, and on earth" (vers. 10. 11) which He did *not* claim for Himself in His pre-existent state, makes the self-denial of Christ negative merely, not positive, as the Apostle's use of the example would seem to require Moreover, if this equality with God

which Christ forbore to arrogate to Himself before the incarnation be the same as the sovereignty which God conferred on Him after His humiliation and sufferings and death, as a reward for such self-devotement (see ver. 9 and Heb. xii. 2), we cannot regard such an equality as, properly speaking, subject to acceptance or rejection till the antecedent historical condition has been fulfilled.—We subjoin a summary of the views of some of the later writers in our own language on this important passage. The meaning which Bishop ELLICOTT prefers is: "He did not deem His equality to God a prize to be seized, but emptied Himself, *etc.;* in other words, He did not insist on His own eternal prerogatives, but, on the contrary, humbled Himself to the condition and sufferings of mortal man." See his *Commentary on Philippians* (*in loc.*) for the grounds of this interpretation. — Prof. LIGHTFOOT presents the philological details at some length. Instead of *ἁρπαγμός*, "the more usual form of the word is *ἅρπαγμα*, which properly signifies simply 'a piece of plunder,' but especially with such verbs as *ἡγεῖσθαι, ποιεῖσθαι, νομίζειν, etc.*, is employed like *ἕρμαιον, εὕρημα*, to denote a highly-prized possession, an unexpected gain." He adduces examples of this usage from some of the later Greek writers. "It appears then from these writers that *ἅρπαγμα ἡγεῖσθαι* frequently signifies nothing more than 'to clutch greedily,' 'prize highly,' 'to set store by,' the idea of plunder or robbery having passed out of sight. The form *ἁρπαγμός*, however, presents a greater difficulty; for neither analogy nor usage is decisive as to its meaning: (1) The termination *-μος* indeed denotes primarily the *process*, so that *ἁρπαγμός* would be 'an act of plundering.' But as a matter of fact substantives in *-μός* are frequently used to describe a concrete thing, *e. g. θεσμός, χρησμός, φραγμός, etc.* (2) And again the particular word *ἁρπαγμός* occurs so rarely that usage cannot be considered decisive. Under these circumstances we may, in choosing between the two senses of *ἁρπαγμός*, fairly assign to it here the one which best suits the context. The meaning adopted above satisfies this condition: '*Though* He pre-existed in the form of God, yet He did not look upon equality with God as a prize which must not slip from His grasp; *but* He emptied Himself, divested Himself, taking upon Him the form of a slave.' The idea is the same as in 2 Cor. viii 9, *δι' ὑμᾶς ἐπτώχευσεν πλούσιος ὤν*. The other rendering (adopted by the A. V.), 'thought it not robbery to be equal with God,' disconnects this clause from its context.*—ALFORD translates: 'who being' (originally) 'in the form of God regarded not as self-enrichment His equality with God.' He observes (1) that *ἁρπαγμός* holds the emphatic place in the sentence; (2) that this fact casts *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ* into the shade as secondary and as referring to the state indicated by *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων* above; and (3) that *ἁρπαγμός* strictly means, as here given, the act of seizing or snatching—not from *another*, but for *one's self*. Dr. WORDSWORTH paraphrases the thought thus: "*Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus,* who subsisting from eternity in the form of God, did not think His own equality with God (*τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ*) was a spoil which He had usurped wrongfully, and of which He might justly *be divested* by another, or which on principles of justice He was Himself *obliged to give up* to another," *etc.* The following is Professor EADIE's paraphrase of the meaning: "The Apostle affirms that Jesus, in His pre-incarnate state, was 'in the form of God;' and adds, that He thought it not a seizure, or a thing to be snatched at, to be on a parity with God, but emptied Himself. Now, it seems to us very plain that the parity referred to is not parity in the abstract, or in anything not found in the paragraph, but parity in possession of this form of God. He was in the form of God, and did not think it a thing to be eagerly laid hold of to be equal with God, having or exhibiting this form. The apostle adds, *ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν*, but emptied Himself, and the clause is in broad and decided contrast with *ἁρπαγμὸν οὐχ ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα τῷ θεῷ*. That is to say, the one clause describes the result of the other. It was because He did not think it a seizure to be equal with God, that He emptied Himself. He did not look simply to His own things—the glories of the Godhead; but He looked to the things of others, and therefore descended to humanity and death. His heart was not so set upon this glory, that he would not appear at any time without it. There was something which he coveted more—something which He felt to be truly a *ἁρπαγμός*, and that was the redemption of a fallen world by His self-abasement and death. From His possession of this "mind," and in indescribable generosity He looked at the things of others, and descended with His splendor eclipsed—appeared not as a God in glory, but clothed in flesh; not in royal robes, but in the dress of a village youth; not as Deity in fire, but a man in tears; not in a palace, but in a manger. . . And in this way He gave the church an example of that self-abnegation and kindness which the apostle has been inculcating, and which the Lord's career is adduced to illustrate and confirm" (*Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle to the Philippians*, pp. 108, 9).—For a list of monographs on this difficult text the reader may see MEYER's "*Briefe an die Philipper*," *etc.*, p. 63 (1859), and WIESINGER's *Commentary on Philippians* (Eng. trans.), p. 61.—H.]

* [Professor LIGHTFOOT states his objections to the rendering of the A. V. in an extended note in his *Commentary* at the end of chap. ii.—H.]

Ver. 7. **But emptied** *or* **stripped himself, and took upon him the form of a servant** (*ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε μορφὴν δούλου λαβών*). The *ἀλλά* introduces the antithesis (not *tamen, nihilominus, quin potius*). The first member corresponds to the second in ver. 6, and the second here to the first there; and at the same time unfolds further the antithesis to *οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο*. In opposition to the *not thinking* of an act stands something done: in opposition to the unwillingness to rob another stands a giving up on His part; and in opposition to the thing which He does not even wish to arrogate to Himself stands His own person which He surrenders. This last contrast appears in *ἑαυτόν*, which precedes with emphasis, in opposition to *ἑαυτῷ τι*, and hence not Himself in opposition to another (MEYER, *et al.*), as the relations in the case and the context show; since the equality with God (*τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ*) was not to be seized from men

or angels, nor could God be deprived of it, but He, the Son, by His own might and will could seize upon it, although it would not be withheld from Him by the Father.—Ἐκένωσε=κενὸν ἐποίησεν, *exinanivit*, divested Himself, *i. e.*, of that which He had, ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, hence of the form of God, of the divine mode of existence. Since He has *emptied* Himself of this, as the word properly means, the μορφή is not something merely external, and since He has given up only the ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, it cannot be an *evacuare* of the person, as if that now had in it no longer anything divine—no δόξα which remained to Him (John i. 14; Col. ii. 9); hence the nearer limitation by μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, which is itself more closely defined. The antithesis is still μορφὴ θεοῦ, and δούλου is chosen, because according to the context (ἴσα θεῷ ver. 6, comp. vers. 10, 11) the κυριότης belongs to the θεότης. It is the *becoming man*, or the incarnation that is meant, as the sequel declares, and since λαβών (which is contemporaneous with ἐκένωσε as in Eph. i. 9, 13) must be taken as a modal limitation of the verb (ἐκένωσε), this emptying of Himself (κένωσις) is the Lord's incarnation. It is incorrect to deny here the *becoming* man, the act of incarnation, and to find only His position as a servant indicated (SCHENKEL), for in this case μορφὴν δούλου λαβών must follow ἐν σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, and could not stand at the beginning; Observe too, that the δούλου is without the article, and hence it does not mean the servant of God, in the sense of the Messiah. The following also are incorrect interpretations: *libenter duxit vitam inopem* (GROTIUS), *miseram sortem, qualis esse servorum solet* (HÖLEMANN), *semet ipse depressit* (VAN HENGEL), *veluti deposuit* (CALOV), *non magis ea usus est* (CLERICUS), since the subject of discourse here is not anything within the human life of Christ, the laying aside of the δόξα, or abstaining from the full use of it.—**And was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man** (ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος). These two clauses plainly belong together. They serve more closely to define μορφὴν δούλου λαβών. BENGEL: *forma dicit aliquid absolutum, similitudo relationem ad alia ejusdem conditionis, habitus refertur ad aspectum et sensum.* Δοῦλος is more exactly defined by ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος; ἐν ὁμοιώματι, ὡς, correspond to μορφήν and indicate the difference between the Lord in the form of a servant, as the son of man, and men. He is not indeed *purus putus homo*, but the incarnate Son of God. Γενόμενος denotes a *becoming*, the human individual development, and preserves the λαβών from being mistaken as a merely outward assumption. Hence ὁμοίωμα is to be understood of the inner and outer, the spiritual and bodily life, and ἐν points this out as the sphere of His development, and the dative σχήματι as the respect in which, or rule according to which, He is found as man. WINER's *Gram.*, p. 215. By σχῆμα (*vultus, vestitus, victus, gestus, sermones et actiones.* BENGEL), is denoted the outward manifestation which is indicated by εὑρεθείς (not equivalent to ὤν), was recognized by all who came into contact with Him. Comp. 1 John i. 1-3. On ὡς ἄνθρωπος THEODORET observes: ἡ γὰρ ἀναληφθεῖσα φύσις ἀληθῶς τοῦτο ἦν, αὐτὸς δὲ τοῦτο οὐκ ἦν, τοῦτο δὲ περιέκειτο. BENGEL: *Vulgaris, ac si nil esset præterea, nec inter homines quidem excelleret; nil sibi sumsit eximium.* It is incorrect to regard ὁμοίωμα and σχῆμα as indistinguishable synonyms (HEINRICHS, *et al.*), or the latter as *dignitas* (GROTIUS), *dress* (ELSNER), γενόμενος as *natus* (RILLIET), ἀνθρώπων as a designation of the *debile et abjectum* (HÖLEMANN), of the *infimæ et contemtæ sortis* (WOLF), or of the first human pair, because He like them was *peccati expers* (GROTIUS).

Ver. 8. **He humbled himself** (ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν). The humiliation described by ἐκένωσε, which took place in His incarnation, because He thereby passed over from the divine into the human mode of existence, is now particularly noted. Here observe the asyndeton, the verb being also connected with ἀλλά, while the position of the verb before the pronoun renders it emphatic. The general description (ἐκένωσε) gives place to the particular one (ἐταπείνωσεν). Hence there is no climax here (MEYER), nor does the latter exceed the former (SCHENKEL), nor does it refer to any humiliation below the dignity of man (HÖLEMANN).—It is more closely defined by the following: **And became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.** Hence it is inadmissible to find in the preceding participial clause (ver. 7) the nearer limitation of ἐταπείνωσεν (WIESINGER), since this cannot be separated from the participial clauses belonging to ἐκένωσε, while ἐταπείνωσεν receives now its limitation. It is not without reference to a μαθεῖν ὑπακοήν, His learning obedience or subjection (Heb. v. 8), that γενόμενος precedes. It is not stated to whom He became ὑπήκοος, since the design was to mark the μορφὴ δούλου, *form of a servant*, according to its nature. If it were more exactly defined the object would be God (ver. 9; Rom. v. 19), not men (GROTIUS). The extent to which this obedience was carried appears in μέχρι θανάτου, *unto death* (Acts xxii. 4; Heb. xii. 4; Matt. xxvi. 38). Hence it is not a *temporal limitation* (VAN HENGEL), nor is it to be joined with ἐταπείνωσεν (BENGEL, *et al.*). Θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ, a construction like σοφίαν—σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου in 1 Cor. ii. 6 (WINER's *Gram.*, p. 443). Δέ often brings forward something new, a more precise statement as opposed to something to be denied or rejected. It is opposed here to the idea of a natural or common death. Death by crucifixion was a punishment for slaves, criminals, outcasts, and hence increased the degradation. Τουτέστι τοῦ ἐπικαταράτου, τοῦ τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἀφωρισμένου (THEOPHYLACT). See Gal. iii. 13.

Ver. 9. **Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him** (διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσε). This was a consequence and result (διό) of the self-renunciation and the self-abasement of the Son. To this act is joined (καί) that of the Father. On the expression see Heb. xiii. 12; Rom. i. 24; Acts x. 29; on the thought Heb. ii. 9, 10; xii. 2. The language here involves an idea of merit on the part of Christ and of recompense on the part of God. The verb marks the antithesis to ἐταπείνωσε μέχρι θανάτου σταυροῦ, and the preposition in the verb (ὑπερύψωσε) indicates that it is an exaltation corresponding to the ὑπεράνω πάντων in Eph. iv. 10. The reference is to the resurrection and ascension, the end of which was His sitting down at the right

hand of God (Matt. xxviii. 18; Mark xvi. 19; Acts vii. 55, 56; Eph. i. 20, 21; Col. iii. 1; Heb. viii. 1). The view of GROTIUS is incorrect: *eum multo sublimiorem fecit, quam antea fuit*, for the Saviour was not *sublimis* on earth (vers. 7, 8), and did not become *sublimior* than He was before the creation of the world (ver. 6), and besides ὑπέρ will not bear that signification. BENGEL: *Exinanitionis præmium justissimum est exaltatio* (Luke xxiv. 26; John x. 17); *neque ea non potuit illam consequi* (John x. 15); *quæcunque Patris sunt, filii sunt; ea non potuere ita Patris esse, ut non essent filii* (John xvii. 5); *Christum Christus exinanivit Christum deus exaltavit* (1 Peter v. 6) *eumque facit pariter deo*.—**And given him the name which is above every name.** Καί introduces the explanation of the ὑπερύψωσε, by which was obtained the εἶναι ἴσα τῷ θεῷ (ver. 6) which Christ would not seize for Himself. Ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ, *denotat, quam accepta deo fuerit exinanitio* (BENGEL). Τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα (WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 140) designates the well-known name which transcends every name, which according to the context is received and borne in heaven and on earth, since it is the *nomen cum re* (BENGEL), which is everywhere manifest and recognized, and includes the adoration of the person of Christ in its divine dignity. It is thus not mere *dignitas* (GROTIUS), or the particular name of Jesus (MICHAELIS), or κύριος (VAN HENGEL).

Ver. 10. **That in the name of Jesus every knee should bow.**—Ἵνα points out the purpose of this exaltation, which reaches its fulfilment, not by a single step, but gradually. See 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26; Rom. xiv. 11; Is. xlv. 23. Ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι stands emphatically at the beginning, and marks the ground and occasion of the πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ. The bending of the knee presents "plastically" (MEYER) the act of adoration. Eph. iii. 14; Rom. xi. 4; and comp. ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου (Acts vii. 59; ix. 14, 21; xxii. 16; 1 Cor. i. 2; Rom. x. 12, 13; 2 Tim. ii. 22). It is therefore not merely *adhibito nomine Jesu* (VAN HENGEL), since indeed Ps. lxiii. 5: ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἀρῶ τὰς χεῖράς μου, is said of prayer to God, nor is it merely a circumlocution for ἐν Ἰησοῦ (ESTIUS), or equivalent to εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, the glorification of His dignity (HEINRICHS), or *quoties auditur nomen* (ERASMUS).—**Of beings in heaven, and beings in earth, and beings under the earth**—comprises the entire realm of worshipping creatures. Τῶν ἐπουρανίων are the angels (Eph. i. 20, 21; Heb. i. 4, 6), τῶν ἐπιγείων, men upon the earth, τῶν καταχθονίων, the dead in Hades. The following are incorrect classifications: οἱ δίκαιοι, οἱ ζῶντες, οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί (CHRYSOSTOM); the dead, the living, the embryos (STOLZ); *homines sortis nobilioris, mediocris et infimæ* (TELLER). The words must not be taken as neuter (BEZA), nor is there in καταχθονίων a reference either to the demons (the Greeks, ERASMUS), which Eph. vi. 12 forbids, or to the souls in purgatory (Catholics).

Ver. 11. **And that every tongue should confess** (καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται).—To the outward, inarticulate expression καί adds still another, the eloquent homage breaking forth from the heart and confessing itself to Him. What the bending of the knee indicates, the tongue expresses (WIESINGER). In πᾶσα the three categories (ver. 10) are included as in πᾶν γόνυ. To refer it therefore to πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (THEODORET) is erroneous, as also to take it *pro omni idiomate* (BEZA).—**That Jesus Christ is Lord.**—Ὅτι introduces the contents of the confession. Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is the subject, and κύριος the predicate, and precedes in accordance with the scope of the context: the kingship is to be pointed out of which the realm is unlimited (Eph. i. 23; iv. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 25, 28). It is not to be limited to rational creatures (HÖLEMANN), or to the Church (RHEINWALD, SCHENKEL).—**To the glory of God the Father** (εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός) belongs properly to the verb, not to the predicate κύριος (BENGEL), from which it is separated by the subject. It presents the end, purpose, of this adoring confession. It is therefore not the same as *in gloria* (Vulg.) or even, θεῷ (VAN HENGEL, who takes ὅτι as causal), as if ἐξομολογεῖν meant *laudibus celebrare*. [In θεοῦ πατρός the first term denotes a relation which God sustains to all His creatures; the second denotes one, which is peculiar to those who believe on His Son (comp. Gal. i. 1). On the universality of this confession see the last paragraph under DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.—H.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The motives* urged in teaching and exhortation are first objective, based upon Christ and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit; and secondly, subjective, as dependent on the character of individuals. Both of these concur in the case of him who teaches and exhorts, and of those dependent on the instructions and exhortations. The objective motives occupy the first place, and to these we should always appeal first of all. Among them stands in the foremost rank the example of Christ, which vers. 5–11 bring into view especially. Among the subjective motives are love and compassion, important beyond comparison with others, for they answer to the objective which come from God, who is love, and to the character of sin, which is an evil, an injury, against which we must be preserved. All other motives are, as it were, crutches, which, as adapted to a sickly self-love, must be finally thrown away, *e. g.*, regard for the judgment of others, fear of punishment, hope of reward. For with human nature as it is, one would not willingly do right, if, without doing so, he could be happy; and he would rather do wrong, if no harm should come to him from it.

2. The Apostle appeals to various motives for the maintenance of *unanimity* in the Church. But the unanimity which he seeks is moral rather than intellectual. It is not *uniformity*, but only the possession of a common centre, around which each one moves in a common love, which, however, may exhibit different degrees of strength and purity in different individuals, just as the centripetal force is capable of manifold gradations.

3. Among the bonds of this concord is *humility*, which in its two-fold intellectual and moral sphere, recognizes clearly both its own gifts and those which others possess, and does not allow one to esteem others less than himself, but prompts him with a sense of his own unworthiness

to regard them more highly, because their unworthiness does not concern him. It is characteristic of humility that it has its centre outside of itself, and includes the great whole of which it is a member within itself; while pride makes the individual himself the centre, and not only breaks loose from the whole, but stands opposed to it, and so becomes the source of all discord and enmity.

4. *Party spirit* and *vain glory* are excluded. The former misuses its neighbor, the latter its own possessions and those of the world; the former presses others down in order to raise itself; the latter draws others to itself in order to please them. The one exalts itself at the expense of others; and the other at the expense of its own real worth; party spirit often brings into action great talents and energy; self contents itself with the mere appearance. However sharply the former may spy out the weaknesses of others and the advantages of particular relations, it is yet sure to destroy itself; or it may be happy in the present moment, while blinded to the evils which follow in its train.

5. *The example of Christ* is here presented to the Church with a fullness and completeness such as is found nowhere else. The whole life, not merely the sufferings of Christ (1 Pet. ii. 21-25), enforces the doctrine, that we ought to deny self in humble love towards our neighbor, and only in such a way desire to share in his glory. If Christ existing in the form of God (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, ver. 6), not seeking the things of Himself (τὰ ἑαυτοῦ σκοπῶν), but also those of others (τὰ ἑτέρων, ver. 4), resolved not to seize for Himself the sovereignty of a God over His creatures (ver. 6), but *in love* (ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ver. 2) and *lowliness of mind* (ταπεινοφροσύνῃ), ennobled and exalted those of mankind, made through Him in His image, and emptied Himself (ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτόν) by becoming a man (ver. 7), obedient in all things, even unto the death of the cross; and God has now exalted Him as the object of worship (vers. 9-11); then we also have no other way open to us to the glory with Him, except through humble self-denying love in fellowship and unity with the brethren.

6. [NEANDER:—That we rightly understand the use made of the example of Christ, as the model after which the Christian life is formed, we must first endeavor to bring the model itself clearly and distinctly before our minds. Before the eye of the Apostle stands the image of THE WHOLE CHRIST, the Son of God, appearing in the flesh, manifesting Himself in human nature. From the human manifestation he rises to the Eternal Word (as John expresses it), that Word which was, before the appearance of the Son of God in time—yea, before the *worlds* were made; in whom before all time God beheld and imaged Himself; as Paul in the Epistle to the Colossians calls Him, in this view, the image of the invisible, *i. e.*, the incomprehensible God. Then, after this upward glance of his spiritual eye, he descends again into the depths of the human life, in which the Eternal Word appears as man. He expresses this in the language of immediate perception, beholding the divine and the human as one; not in the form of abstract truth, attained by a mental analysis of the direct object of thought. Thus he contemplates the entrance of the Son of God into the form of humanity as a self-abasement, a self-renunciation, for the salvation of those whose low estate He stooped to share. He whose state of being was divine, who was exalted above all the wants and limitations of the finite and earthly existence, did not eagerly claim this equality with God which He possessed; but, on the contrary, He concealed and disowned it in human abasement, and in the form of human dependence. And as the whole human life of Christ proceeded from such an act of self-renunciation and self-abasement, so did His whole earthly life correspond to this one act even to His death; the consciousness on the one hand of divine dignity which it was in His power to claim, and on the other the concealment, the renunciation of this, in every form of humiliation and dependence belonging to the earthly life of man. The crowning point appears in His death—the ignominious and agonizing death of the cross. Paul then proceeds to show what Christ attained by such self-renunciation, thus carried to the utmost limit, by such submissive obedience in the form of a servant; the reward which He received in return, the dignity which was conferred upon Him. Here, too, is presented the universal law, laid down by Christ Himself, that whoso humbles himself, and in proportion as he humbles himself, shall be exalted.—H.]

7. Concerning the *person of Christ*, the passage before us states the following truths: (*a*) His *ego*, His essential entity, is an antemundane person, who had a divine mode of existence (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων). He is thus to be conceived of as existing within the being of God, as πρὸς τὸν θεόν (John i. 1), yet not merely as a thought, a principle, but as a person, λόγος ἄσαρκος. (*b*). Before the world was, before any creature existed, there was still wanting to Him who is ἴσος θεῷ, the τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, a kingdom, and a people over which He might rule as the Anointed One at the right hand of the majesty of the Father. (*c*) He gave up His μορφὴν θεοῦ, *the form of God*, not His *ego*, not the possession of the glory, the κτῆσις of the δόξα. He assumed *a servant's form* (μορφὴν δούλου), not sin, in becoming man. With the incarnation His humiliation began, in which He exhibited obedience even to the death of the cross, the shameful death of a slave. Within the human life also, which began with the incarnation, there were degrees of exinanition or self-divestment from Bethlehem to Golgotha. (*d*) He humbled not His nature, but only His personal existence, Himself, by the assumption of human nature and by His entrance into the life of men, so as to subject Himself to ignominy and death. He thus humbled Himself not *through* the obedience, but *in* the obedience which He rendered to the Father's will, without sin, even in the most extreme trials that befell Him. (*e*) Such merit was followed by exaltation, which consisted in this, that He now became as κύριος, the object of worship for the whole realm of created spirits unto the praise of God the Father. (*f*) Into this position of exaltation the Father has placed the loved and loving Son. (*g*) In the worship of Jesus Christ the glory of the Father is constantly to be kept in view, as is the case in the public prayers and collects of the Evangelical Churches of the Reformation.

8. Our passage teaches nothing concerning the relation of the divine and the human nature, and of their attributes, to each other, of the relation of the two natures to the personal unity, or of the κτῆσις, or possession of the divine δόξα, or glory, to the χρῆσις, or use, of the same. Here we have opened to the efforts of Christological inquiry a wide and important domain which was measured and is measured or limited only by the fundamental conditions or outposts of Christianity, such as the hypostatic union, and based upon this the real communion of natures, which includes both the divine δόξα, as opposed to Ebionitism, Pelagianism, Socinianism, Rationalism, and the human development against Docetism and Romanism, and so the immutability as well as the self-limitation of the absolute God.

9. *History* of the interpretation of the text and of its doctrinal application. (*a*) The ancient Church almost throughout, before and after the Council of Nicæa, taught that the λόγος ἄσαρκος did not retain the divine δόξα for Himself, for His own advantage, while yet He did not cease, as λόγος ἔνσαρκος, to be what He was. His incarnation was not a yielding up of His divinity, but an assumption of humanity, which was taken up into His divinity. Only AMBROSIASTER, PELAGIUS, NOVATIAN, maintained opposite views. (*b*) The middle ages honored the divine nature at the expense of the human. THOMAS AQUINAS admitted only an outward development, in age and wisdom, with reference to men to whom He daily gave new proofs of it. (*c*) The Reformation harmonizes in general in the true confession of faith, yet the Lutherans, upon the fundamental principle, *finitum capax esse infiniti*, which the Reformed (Calvinists) denied, extended further the doctrine of the two natures and conditions of Christ. Thus LUTHER, led by his doctrine on the Lord's Supper, concludes from the form which Christ possesses, exalted at the right hand of God (which is conceived of, not as a place of abode, but as a mode of existence), that the humanity was taken up into the divine glory, and that from the incarnation onwards the condition of humiliation appears more as a veiling, self-limitation, that of exaltation as a complete, visible revelation of the divine life. So in the *Formula Concordiæ*, VIII., which, by "its very indefiniteness allows room for further examination," concerning which see FRANK, *Theologie der F. C.*, III., pp. 165 ff. The controversy of the theologians of Giessen and Tübingen, since 1607, did not concern itself about the κτῆσις, the possession of the divine glory, which was undisputed, but only about the χρῆσις, the use of it. The former, MENZER and FEUERBORN, with the F. C., maintained a κένωσιν χρήσεως, the latter, HAFFENREFFER, THUMMIUS, NICOLAI, only a κρύψιν χρήσεως, in respect to which the *Decisio Saxonica*, 1624, places itself on the side of the Giessen theologians, without reaching any very important result. (*d*) The modern development of Christology began with regarding the Son of God, the pre-existent God-man, as *being* in the perfect man (GOSCHEL), then attempted to conceive of the same as *becoming* the God-man (ROTHE, DORNER). THOMASIUS (*Christi Person and Werk*, II., §§ 40, 43), following HOFMANN (*Schriftbeweis* II.), went farther, since he supposed a self-abdication of the real attributes of the divine nature, amounting to a συγκοπή of the divine life of the Logos, or a sleep-like unconsciousness, and thus both impaired the *unio personalis* and assumed an exclusion of the Son from the Trinity during the earthly life of Christ. GESS (*Die Lehre von der Person Christi*), and GEORG LUDW. HAHN (*Theologie des N. T.* 1.) suppose a self-abnegation also of the immanent attributes, while SCHENKEL (*Die Christ. Dogmatik*, II.) does not proceed beyond the mere human nature, and falls into Socinianism. Others again revive Apollinarism. Comp. DORNER, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*, II., pp. 1203 ff.

9. The correct standpoint even for our time which, in the effort to conceive of the human development of the Redeemer, is in danger of lowering His divine personality, is shown by CHEMNITZ: *Reliqua vero, quæ vel quæri vel disputari possunt, et in verbo non habent expressam patefactionem, cum magni hujus profunditatem in hac vita exhaurire et pervidere non possimus, ita me differre et rejicere ad magnam illam cœlestem, æternam et illustrem scholam, ubi gloriam Christi salvatoris et fratris nostri ad faciem sicut est videbimus. Nec propter ea, quæ explicare non possum, ab illis, quæ expresso verbo patefacta sunt, discedere me debere. Hæc responsio, si videbitur rudior, simplicior et puerilior, non pugnabo, sed scio veram, certam, firmam et omnium tutissimam esse.* It is important to hold fast the ethical and practical sense of the passage, and to deny neither the constant unchangeableness of the divinity of the Son in itself (John i. 1, 18; iii. 13), nor His real, loving, self-denying, and self-abasing entrance into fellowship with sinful humanity in life and in death (John i. 14; xvii. 5).

10. [The final and universal acknowledgment of Christ's sovereignty (ver. 10) is affirmed also in Rom. xiv. 11. All the hosts of heaven and the myriads of the human race who still live, or have lived, or shall live, are to "bend the knee" before Him who bears the "name which is above every name," who, as the Apostle John has said, wears "the title written on His vesture and His thigh, 'King of kings and Lord of lords'" (Rev. xix. 16). But this language is to be understood in harmony with the teachings of other passages. "Even the enemies of Christ," says Dr. THOLUCK, "who reject the gospel, acknowledge the reality of His power, if they are unable to resist the decisions of His justice, *i. e.*, if at the end of the world they are excluded from all part in the blessings of His Kingdom; while those who have repented and submitted to His claims are received to the joys and the rewards of heaven. Both classes in this case yield to Him the homage of their submission. But according to a just distinction which some of the older writers have made, that of the one is *obedientia ex animo, i. e.*, a voluntary, hearty obedience; that of the other, *obedientia cum tremore*, a subjection reluctant, extorted by fear." Viewed in this light, the passage in our Epistle is parallel entirely to that in 2 Thess. i. 7–10. (*Disputatio Christologica de loc. Paul Phil.* II. 2 ff.—H.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Motives (ver. 1), aim (vers. 2–4), and method

(vers. 5–11) of a Christian teacher, a spiritual father.—We must ever start from what we have in order to get forward and upward. First, fulfil thine own duty, which should be to thee a pleasure, not a burden, and then lay hold of the good that is in others, be it ever so little, or merely supposed to be there; yet assume it, use it without complaint or mistrust.—Truth is one, simple, and yet so infinitely rich that there can be *unanimity* and yet no *monotony*, like the harmony in a choir of many voices. Most controversies in the church have moved and still move *around* the germ of the truth, *around* the fundamental doctrine, but do not touch exactly the thing itself. They have reference only to the *human* confirmation of the truth, its mediation through conceptions, or mode of apprehension, and affect not the Christian character of the individual, provided only he abides in love.—Not, how art thou esteemed by thy neighbor, but, how dost thou serve him, is the main point.—He is great who humbles himself in obedience, but disobedience dishonors and degrades; the former recognises the higher will, and looks forward to the glorious end; the latter is concerned only with itself, and does not get beyond self.—Self-seeking is a deadly plague to the soul.—The example of Jesus Christ instructs, directs, leads, makes the way of the cross a path of light; He went no other way, and the Christian also, His disciple, may not go a different one.

STARKE:—If we would make people religious we must not use the wheel and the sword in the church, or fight them with the iron Bible, or preach fables; but build our exhortation upon Christ, the fellowship of the Spirit, the fellowship of God, for such arguments pierce through bone and marrow.—Love of honor in a preacher is a baneful poison, a prolific source of dissension in the church of God.—Self-seeking destroys country and people, churches and schools, cities and houses.—Who has knees to bend, let him bend them! Christ is the One most worthy of glory, the One whom we can never fully honor.

[ROBERT HALL:—Christianity was never intended to destroy the different stations and gradations of life; but it is intended to destroy that arrogance and superciliousness with which rank and splendor are too often borne. As it teaches the poor humility and submission, so it teaches the rich humanity, gentleness, and compassion. In this respect it merges all distinctions (ver. 3).—H.].

RIEGER:—He who exalts himself above others, thinks that others also must accommodate themselves to him, acts as if they must regard his rights and their maintenance as of the first importance. With respect to the self-abasement of Christ, the language always was: HE humbled Himself in order to show His obedient, willing spirit; but with reference to His exaltation, the language is: GOD has raised Him up, placed Him at His right hand, *etc.*, in order to distinguish Him as the Author and Finisher of our faith, the pioneer in the way of faith by which we must now come to God.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—Unity of mind among all Christians can be nothing else than unity in the knowledge that Christ is the Redeemer of the world, and in the disposition to recognize Him as such, and to accept Him as Leader in the way of salvation. 1) In what respects especially the Redeemer is our example. 2) How can we imitate this example?

HEUBNER:—It is characteristic of the Christian that he does not think highly of himself, but is disposed to regard others as more important, more deserving. He acknowledges gladly their excellencies and gives way to them. Such humility towards men, unaffected, and yielding the pre-eminence which pride arrogates to itself, flows from humility towards God.

[NEANDER:—One's judgment of another (see ver. 3) is not within the control of his own will. How can he esteem his brother higher than himself, if this is not in accordance with the truth, if he cannot but perceive in himself excellencies which are wanting in the other, and defects in the other from which he himself is free. Is humility to be grounded upon falsehood? Most certainly not. But there is here presupposed, as resulting from the development of the Christian life, a pervading temper of heart, of which such a judgment of one's self in comparison with others is but the necessary and natural expression. The Christian's love will lead him first of all to discern what is good in another: to discover even in his blemishes his peculiar gifts, that in which he is really superior to himself; while on the other hand, through a self-scrutiny, sharpened by the Spirit which quickens him, he detects with rigorous exactness his own faults. And this self-rigor, united with love, will give leniency to his judgment of whatever may obscure the divine life in others.—H.].

PASSAVANT:—Strife and vain glory are pests in hearts, houses, families, congregations, cities, the state, the church.

As the Epistle for Palm Sunday (vers. 5–11).

RAUTENBERG:—The Mediator crowned with praise and honor on account of His sufferings and death. 1) By the world before God; 2) by God before the world.

ZEISS:—Royal image of the Christian who consecrates his life to the Lord; 1) Humility of heart is his costly adornment; 2) the blessing of love his joyful delight; 3) pleasing God his exalted aim; and 4) harvesting of the seed his heavenly reward.

Law and Testimony:—What a Christian shares with his Lord Jesus: 1) the cross; 2) the glory. Conditions of the church of Christ; 1) its servitude; 2) its glory. The palms which we strew in the path of the Lord Jesus: 1) That we believe in the Crucified One; 2) that we trust in the Exalted One. The five-fold hosanna with which we prepare the way of the Lord Jesus: hosanna (1) of humility, (2) of patience, (3) of faith, (4) of prayer, and (5) of hope.

PROHLE:—The Epistle on Palm Sunday an earnest reminder of the entrance into the passion week. It reminds us, 1) of the cross and death of Christ; 2) of His innocence and holiness; 3) of His divine dignity; 4) of His complete subjection to God's will; 5) of the triumphant end of His sufferings.—The traits of a true imitation of Christ: 1) Humility; 2) Self-denial; 3) Obedience unto death.

God helps believers in their endeavors to imitate Christ.

(II. 12-18.)

12 Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only,
but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and
13 trembling. For it is God who worketh in you both to will and to do of (*or* for)
14 his good pleasure. Do all things without murmurings and disputings [doubtings].
15 That ye may be [become][1] blameless and harmless [pure] (the) sons [children] of
God, without rebuke,[2] in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation [generation],
16 among whom ye shine [appear] as lights [luminaries][3] in the world, holding forth
the word of life; that I may rejoice in the day of Christ, that I have not run in
17 vain, neither labored in vain. Yea, and if [But, if also] I be offered upon [in] the
18 sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy [rejoice], and I rejoice with you all. For
the same cause (also) do ye [also] joy [rejoice], and rejoice with me.

[1] Ver. 15. Γενέσθαι in ℵ B, *et al.* has better support than ἦτε in A, *et al.*
[2] *Ibid.* Ἄμωμα, found in ℵ A B C *et al.*, is better supported than ἀμώμητα, but as the more common form in the N. T. might more readily displace the latter, than the reverse.
[3] [*Ibid.* The Greek for *luminaries* (φωστῆρες), says Lightfoot, is used almost exclusively of the heavenly bodies. It occurs again in the N. T. only in Rev. xxi. 11, where also it should be so rendered.—H.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 12. **Wherefore,** ὥστε, refers to what precedes, as in iv. 1. See WINER's *Gram.* p. 301. Ὑπηκούσατε is correlative with γενόμενος ὑπήκοος, and τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν corresponds to vers. 9–11. The exhortation borrows its coloring indeed from vers. 8-11, but, like the example of Christ adduced as an illustration, it reaches back to the entire course of thought (vers. 1-11), and hence does not attach itself merely to ver. 11 (SCHENKEL), to the last thing discussed (vers. 6-11, MEYER) or to i. 27 ff. (DE WETTE).—**My beloved** (ἀγαπητοί μου) shows the Apostle's joy and deep interest in them (ver. 2).—**As ye have always obeyed** (καθὼς πάντοτε ὑπηκούσατε) singles out the act on the part of the Philippians, upon which he now builds his hope that his exhortation will not be in vain. *Mihi ad salutem vos hortanti, ipsique deo* (BENGEL). The context requires this explanation.—**Not as in my presence only.** Μή belongs to the following imperative (κατεργάζεσθε); for if the negative belonged to ὑπηκούσατε, with which Luther wrongly connects it, οὐ would have been used. Ὡς, according to its use in a participial clause, points out a possible idea of the Philippians, that such compliance with Paul's admonition must be necessary only in his presence. See WINER's *Gram.* p. 617. Hence it is not a term of comparison (HÖLEMANN).—**But now much more in my absence** (ἀλλὰ νῦν πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐν τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ μου) urges the stronger necessity for self-exertion, because they are left to themselves, without the assistance of the Apostle who is now far distant. *Quia ego vobis non adesse possum, ipsi vos curateeo magis* (BENGEL).—**Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.** Μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου refers (as in Eph. vi. 5) to that tender conscientiousness, that fear in the presence of the omnipresent God, which feels that no effort or solicitude can be too great. It does not refer to a servant's relation (BENGEL: *servi esse debetis, examplo Christi*, ver. 8), nor to spiritual pride (RILLIET), nor to resignation to God's will (MATTHIES). Τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν marks the salvation as that of the Philippians themselves (ἑαυτῶν not being here used for ἀλλήλων, FLATT, *et al.*), who in this case ought to regard the things of themselves (τὰ ἑαυτῶν σκοπεῖν) as the glorious end of the κατεργάζεσθε. On ἑαυτῶν see WINER's *Gram.*, p. 150 sq. Κατεργάζεσθαι means *to bring to pass* (*perficere usque ad metam*, BENGEL), for which energetic perseverance is requisite. The mode of this is indicated by ὑπηκούσατε, as also by the example of Christ (ver. 8).

Ver. 13. **For it is God who worketh in you** (θεὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν). The Apostle strengthens his exhortation here by reminding them that if they disregard it they will not merely suffer personal loss, (τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν), but strive against another, the Highest, whose work and working they would disturb and bring to naught. It confirms the entire exhortation, though it designates only the τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν specially as their aim and labor. Thus it is neither a ground of encouragement (CHRYSOSTOM, MEYER, *et al.*), nor an incentive to humility (CALVIN, SCHENKEL, *et al.*); for it is not designed to confirm exclusively either κατεργάζεσθε or μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου. Notwithstanding God's activity, which is shown by ἐστὶν ὁ ἐνεργῶν to be constant, and by ἐν ὑμῖν to be exerted in the hearts of individuals, every one should be careful both as to what he does or omits to do. Of God it is not said that He *effectually* works (κατεργάζεται) to will and to do, since He does not indeed accomplish this result in all; but He is only said ἐνεργεῖν, because where it is effected, it is not without His assistance; which of course to be effective (κατεργάζεσθαι) requires obedience on their part (ὑπακούειν). HÖLEMANN wrongly explains ἐν ὑμῖν as *intra cœtum vestrum* [and others 'among you.'—H.]. What God works is espe-

cially—**Both to will and to do**, *καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν*. The first is the self-determination, the second the personal exertion: both take place in the heart of the believer. The first originates, the second carries out in the life; both are conditions of the *κατεργάζεσθαι*.—**Of** *or* **for his good pleasure** *ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας* is a nearer limitation of *ἐνεργῶν*. God's working has its ground within Himself (His *εὐδοκία*), and is not occasioned or controlled by anything out of Himself, and in man. The article defines the disposition as well known. Comp. Rom. xv. 8: *ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ*. See WINER's *Gram.* p. 383. [The preposition *ὑπέρ* does not represent the *εὐδοκία* as the mere *ratio* of the action, or the mere *norma* according to which it is done, but as the *interested cause* of it; the *commodum* of the *εὐδοκία* was that which the action was designed to subserve (ELLICOTT).—H.]. On *εὐδοκία* see i. 15; Eph. i. 5. The meaning of *ὑπέρ* cannot be *κατά*, *secundum*, nor can the *εὐδοκία* of the Philippians be meant (ERASMUS, *et al.*)

Ver. 14. **Do all things without murmurings and doubtings.** *Πάντα* is limited only by the context: all which is to be done in reference to salvation, for which God gives the willing and the working. [The verb (*ποιεῖτε*) here comprehends in its full compass suffering as well as doing. The patience with which the Christian endures the trials to which God may call him illustrates his character not less decisively than the habit of active obedience.—H.] *Ποιεῖτε* marks only the act, the nature and mode of which are determined by the disposition of the doer (*χωρὶς γογγυσμῶν καὶ διαλογισμῶν*). The preposition denotes, like *ἄνευ* (1 Pet. iv. 9) a separation, but the difference between them is, that the former represents the subject, the latter the object as distant. The Philippians ought to be distant, separated, from murmurings and doubtings: *ἄνευ* would indicate that these ought to be far from the Philippians (Eph. ii. 12); and see TITTMANN *Syn.*, 1, pp. 93-97. The distinction between the two substantives is, that the first (*γογγυσμοι*) belongs to the unwilling, weak, and still stubborn spirit, the second (*διαλογισμοί*) to the doubtful spirit, which does not see its way clearly. The former proceeds from the will, the latter from the intellect. SCHENKEL refers the first to the defiant, the second to the timid heart. BENGEL supposes the *ἄμεμπτοι* in ver. 15 to refer back to *γογγυσμοί*, and *ἀκέραιοι* to *διαλογισμῶν*. We are not to understand by the latter term *disputation*, *controversy* (WIESELER, ERASMUS, *et al.*), contrary to the usage of the New Testament. This word is not to be limited, as *e. g.* to God only (MEYER, *et al.*), to superiors (ESTIUS, *et al.*), or fellow Christians (CALVIN, WIESELER, *et al.*). [As *γογγυσμός* is the moral, so *διαλογισμός* is the intellectual rebellion against God (LIGHTFOOT).—H.]

Ver. 15. **That ye may become blameless and pure.** *Ἵνα* marks the end, *γένησθε* the way, which is *a becoming*, a process of development. *Ἄμεμπτοι*, *unblamable*, those (according to the Greek form) in whom there is nothing to blame (1 Thess. iii. 13), represents the moral integrity as manifesting itself outwardly; *ἀκέραιοι* (from *κεράννυμι*), *unmixed* (Rom. xvi. 19; Matt. x. 16), presents 'the same according to its inner character' (MEYER). The first is that from which we can judge of the second, for it is the condition of it; the inward answers to the outward.—**Children of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation** [not *nation* as in the A. V.—H.] *Τέκνα θεοῦ* sums up both predicates, such *are* they as Christians: but in Christ (Eph. i. 5; Gal. iv. 5) they should *become ἄμωμα* (without *μῶμος*, Eph. i. 4; v. 27; Col. i. 22, *in quo non est, quod reprehendatur*), or *ἀμώμητα* (from *μωμάομαι*, 2 Pet. iii. 14, *qui reprehendi non potest*), and this in spite of and in their actual circumstances. *Μέσον* (here as a preposition, see WINER's *Gram.*, p. 471) *γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς καὶ διεστραμμένης*. Comp. Acts ii. 40; 1 Pet. ii. 18; Matt. xvii. 17; Luke ix. 41. *Γενεά* is used *de ætatis alicujus hominibus*. The first adjective describes the outward, dishonest, perverted demeanor; the second the inward, distorted character. Manifestly there is an allusion here to a passage in the important chapter which serves as a basis of prophecy (Deut. xxxii. 5): *ἡμάρτοσαν οὐκ αὐτῷ τέκνα μωμητά, γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη*.—**Among whom ye shine as luminaries in the world.** [The active (*φαίνειν*) means *to shine* (see John i. 5; 2 Pet. i. 19; Rev. i. 16); but the middle means to *appear*, as in Matt. xviii. 27; 1 Pet. iv. 18 and James iv. 14. The A. V. does not always observe the distinction.—H.] *Ἐν οἷς* belongs *ad sensum* to *γενεᾶς* (WINER's *Gram.*, p. 141). The verb, *φαίνεσθε*, not *φαίνετε*, describes their becoming visible, being recognized as God's children. Hence it is not *luceatis* (BENGEL), still less is it the imperative (PELAGIUS, ERASMUS, *et al.*). [Christians were not to be, but now actually *were*, as luminaries in a dark, heathen world (ELLICOTT).—H.] The apostle calls to their mind what they are, in order that they may show themselves to be such. But *ὡς φωστῆρες* introduces a new figure, to designate the immoral character of the world: Christians are the stars, illuminators, *ἐν κόσμῳ*, in the world, which in itself is as dark as night. Hence *ἐν κόσμῳ* is not to be joined with *φαίνεσθε* (DE WETTE), nor is *φαίνονται* to be supplied (RILLIET, *et al.*); neither is it equivalent to "in the heavens" (RHEINWALD), nor is it *dat. commodi*, "for the world" (STORR). [This form (*φωστῆρες*) occurs elsewhere in the N. T. only in Rev. xxi. 11, where it has the same sense.—H.]

Ver. 16. **Holding forth the word of life**, presents the mode of the *φαίνεσθε*. *Λόγον ζωῆς* receives illustration from the connection which exists between life and light (John i. 4: *ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς*): life is light, Christ is the life (John vi. 48; xiv. 6) and the light (John viii. 62; ix. 5; xii. 46), and indeed the source of them; His followers are also light, but it is a derived light (Matt. v. 14); the essence of the gospel is light (Eph. v. 8; Col. i. 12), and the life is in the word, and as the thought breaks forth in the word, so also the light and the life. Accordingly *ἐπέχοντες* is used and not merely *ἔχοντες*. The Christian holds forth the word of life, living it, living out what is living within him. Hence *τῷ λόγῳ προσέχοντες* (THEODORET) is incorrect, for we have not the dative (Acts iii. 5); and so also is "holding fast" (LUTHER).—The aim and result is: **That I may rejoice in** [or, more literally, **for a rejoicing to me against**] **the**

day of Christ (εἰς καύχημα ἐμοὶ εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ). Comp. i. 10, 26. The cause of his rejoicing then will be: **That I have not run in vain, neither labored in vain** (ὅτι οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἔδραμον οὐδὲ εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασα). The first expression, which recalls the contests of the *stadium* or race, denotes his zeal and the wide reach of his activity (not confined to one place); the second (derived from κόπος, *toil*) indicates the labor and effort which his ministry involves. The modifying οὐκ εἰς κενόν follows: *in vain, i. e. without fruit or result* (2 Cor. vi. 1; Gal. ii. 2; 1 Thess. iii. 5), which thus occasions the repetition, and does not merely arise from his feeling of joy in the consciousness that such is the result (MEYER).

Ver. 17. **But if also I be offered.** 'Αλλά introduces an antithesis which εἰ shows to be conditional. What this antithesis is, καὶ before σπένδομαι shows. ["My labors have been severe, unintermitted. *But* not content with this I am willing (if that is reserved for me) to suffer a martyr's death."—H.] The meaning of σπένδομαι is: *I am poured out as a drink-offering*, presented as a libation, as in 2 Tim. iv. 6. Comp. Numb. xxviii. 7; xv. 4 sq. [The present tense represents the act as in progress. "If I am being poured out," *etc.*—H.] The libation-wine, set apart from its common use, serving as an expression of joy (Ps. civ. 15; Eccles. x. 19), as an image of quickening grace (Prov. ix. 2; Isaiah lv. 1), as a sweet savor (2 Cor. ii. 15; Rom. xv. 16), serves to represent the Apostle (separated from them by his δεσμοί), as giving up his personal and official *ego*, his life and his desires, pouring out in a martyr's death his blood as a sweet savor. The Apostle's death by the sword is here alluded to, the present marking it as impending (i. 20). Καὶ connects this death by martyrdom with ἔδραμον and ἐκοπίασα, his sufferings with his labors; the latter have not been fruitless, and the former also shall not be so.—Hence the following is added: **Upon (in) the sacrifice and service of your faith.** 'Επί points to the circumstances of the σπένδεσθαι; this takes place in τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ. Both are united under one article, and are hence conceived of as a unity. The second is the priestly service (Luke i. 23; Heb. viii. 6), hence the first is the act of offering, not *victima* (WIESINGER). The offering itself is designated by the genitive: τῆς πιστέως ὑμῶν, with respect to which the Apostle exercises his priestly functions, presenting it to God, while he himself is the accompanying drink-offering, since his blood is poured forth. As the former results in his glory, so now this results in his joy. [The Hebrews, in offering their sacrifices, poured out often a libation or drink-offering at the same time. See Ex. xxix. 40; Numb. xxviii. 7. The costume of the thought in this passage is evidently derived from that practice. The faith of the Philippians, according to the Apostle's allusion, is viewed as a sacrifice which they have brought to the altar for the purpose of presenting it to God. The Apostle himself with reference to his agency in their salvation, officiates as the priest who offers this sacrifice for them. The act of presenting it is styled here a λειτουργία, *i. e.*, as the word imports, *a sacerdotal service*, or *ministry* (see Luke i 23; Heb. viii. 6). Paul declares now, in the ardor of his affection for the Philippians, that if it be necessary in order that he may discharge his priestly office more perfectly, or that the sacrifice of their faith may be more acceptable unto God, that his blood should be shed as a libation for them, he is willing to *die* in their behalf. He has in view the possibility of his martyrdom, and the effect which he hopes may result from that event, in strengthening their faith and preparing them for heaven.—H.] RILLIET's rendering of σπένδομαι, I am sprinkled, is incorrect, for it is the present tense; ἐπί has not the sense of "to" (WIESINGER), or *super* (VAN HENGEL), since θυσία is not *victima*. There is no antithesis here to i. 25 (DE WETTE), of which no reader would readily think, for what intervenes (i. 26–ii. 1 sq.) makes that connection at too remote places, or to i. 25, as if he had hoped to live to see the perfection of his readers, but now supposes the opposite (MEYER, WIESINGER, *et al.*), or as if he had thought at first that he should live to see the coming of the Lord (VAN HENGEL) which is not here in question. It should not be joined with the following χαίρω (BENGEL).—**I rejoice, and rejoice with you all,** χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν. THEOPHYLACT: οὐχ ὡς ὁ ἀποθανούμενος λυποῦμαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαίρω ὅτι σπονδὴ γίνομαι. Paul rejoices in the prospect of a martyr's death; but not for himself merely; he rejoices with the Church also, which will thus experience and acknowledge the blessing of martyrdom. MEYER, contrary to the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament (Luke i. 58; xv. 6, 9; 1 Cor. xii. 26; xiii. 6, where it means in each case to rejoice *with others*) takes συγχαίρω as *congratulor* together with the Vulg., BENGEL, *et al.* [This is also LIGHTFOOT's interpretation.—H.]

Ver. 18. **For the same cause** (τὸ δ' αὐτό, governed by the verb) presents the cause of the joy to which in conclusion he earnestly exhorts them from his example. [Instead of being grieved that they should be such gainers at his expense, he would have them share his joy in being permitted to yield up his life with such gain to himself and such benefit to them.—H.]—**Do ye also rejoice, and rejoice with me,** καὶ ὑμεῖς χαίρετε καὶ συγχαίρετέ μοι. These are imperatives, not indicatives (ERASMUS). The following explanations are wrong: *gratulamini mihi, libato* (BENGEL); *subauditur* κατά with τὸ δ'αὐτό (BEZA); τὸ δ'αὐτό=ὡσαύτως (RHEINWALD, RILLIET, WIESINGER, who cites Matt. xxvii. 44). BENGEL: *martyrii præstantia.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL

1. A great blessing rests upon fellowship with Christians, whether they be mature or not (ver. 12), for it tends to the development of Christian character and life; but not merely upon fellowship with those who are present to the senses: the spiritual man ought to make his influence reach to the absent also. The more he does this the better.

2. In connection with faith which comes from the preaching of the divine word (Rom. x. 17: ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος θεοῦ), obedience is demanded (ὑπακοή, ver. 12: ὑπηκούσατε).

This gives keenness to the tender conscience, which dreads to disregard or to seem to cast contempt upon God and His gifts (*μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου*). *Quamvis enim gratis in uno Christo per fidem apprehenso servemur, tamen per viam justitiæ ad salutem contendere nos oportet, cum filii dei ejus spiritu ducantur* (BEZA), hence they must follow, because in His strength they are able to do it. We belong to God through Christ, and we should, by obedience to Him and to His word, prove this relationship.

3. Our salvation is as much God's work as our own. The beginning of a new life in the soul is entirely an act of God, which the Holy Spirit effects in our spirit, but not in our consciousness; yet in such a manner that we become conscious of it as an act of God. We do not create ourselves men; God creates us (HARLESS, *Ethics*, p. 229). He works in us constantly the willing and the doing. But we can resist Him, withdraw ourselves from Him. He does not work irresistibly, determinatively. But because He works thus in us, we may not remain idle, we must be fearful lest we lose this work of grace, fearful on account of our weakness, and the dangers in and around us, and must cherish and follow this willing and working effected by God.

4. [NEANDER:—Paul always represents the salvation of man as something which can be accomplished only through the grace of God as the work of God in man. But he adds (ver. 13) a more exact designation of the temper of heart with which Christians should work out their salvation, *viz.*, "with fear and trembling." This would not be appropriate if he were speaking of what lay merely in the hand of man, in which case all would depend upon his own strength. It is because Paul is conscious of the weakness and insufficiency of all human strength, because he presupposes that man can do nothing without God, and must constantly watch over himself, lest through his own fault he lose the aid of divine grace, without which all human efforts are in vain; it is for this reason that he designates this temper of mind as one of fear and trembling, as the feeling of personal accountability and helplessness, of insecurity and instability in ourselves, by which we may be ever admonished to continual watchfulness, and to ever-renewed waiting upon God as the fountain of all our strength. Hence, as the ground of such an admonition, he appeals to this consciousness that we can of ourselves do nothing, that it is God who alone bestows upon us the power to will and to perform what is needful to our salvation; that all, indeed, depends upon his sovereign will. This feeling of dependence, the ground-tone of the Christian life, is ever to be maintained. It is this which must combat the presumption of a vain human self-reliance, which, finding itself deceived in the result, so easily gives place to dejection and despair. (See vers. 12, 13.—H.].

5. The goal is reached by a gradual process (ver 15: *γένησθε*). *Renovatio non est talis mutatio, quæ uno momento statim omnibus suis partibus perficiatur ac absolvatur, sed habet sua initia, suos progressus, quibus in magna infirmitate perficitur.* (GERHARD, *loc.* xii. 9, § 126). *Fiunt in conversione inchoationes similes conceptioni, non tamen solum concipi, sed et nasci opus est; nihil tamen horum fit sine gratuita dei misericordia* (AUGUSTINE).

6. *Φόβος καὶ τρόμος* may not be omitted, for in the *renovatio* just as full a view is given of the *magna potentia Dei* as of the *magna infirmitas hominis.* But *γογγυσμὸς καὶ διαλογισμός* must be absent, for the first springs from self-confidence, contentment with one's self, the second from mistrust towards God and His gifts as the source of power; the first excites a sullen will towards God, the second turns the confused spirit away from God, and ends in despair.

7. Every Christian has a mission in the world, to let his light shine round about him, and to be anxious that the darkness of the world, though it is around him, shall on this very account not be and remain in him.

8. The word of God must, as a *word of life*, manifest itself actively in the personal traits of the Christian, that there may be an eloquent sermon without word of mouth, in the still, noiseless walk and character.

9. As death is no loss to the Christian, still less is the martyr's death, which is rather a ground and cause of thankful joy for the Church and for the martyr himself.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The work of thy salvation is (1) God's work wrought upon thee and in thee; (2) the work of the Church, within which it takes place; (3) thine own work, since thou consentest to it.—God does not give thee the flower and the fruit of salvation, but the seed, the sunshine and the rain. He does not give houses, nor yet beams and squared stones, but trees, and rocks, and limestone, and says: Now build thyself a house. Regard not God's work within thee as an anchor to hold thy bark firmly to the shore, but as a sail which shall carry it to its port.—Fear thy depression and faint-heartedness, but take courage at thy humility before God. Consider God's gifts, thy employment of them, the final reckoning before Him. Ever become more and more what thou really art, a light in the world.—Even in sorrow and the deepest pain, overlook not the reasons for joy.

STARKE:—Behold the character of righteous children, scholars, and hearers, who in their parents and teachers really see God, and therefore are obedient, as well in their absence as in their presence, since they have the everywhere-present God before their eyes and in their hearts. Our Christianity does not lead one to hide himself in deserts and convents, and thus to remain blameless, but in the midst of the perverted, degenerate world to guard himself from sin. Such knighthood will God have from us.—When the joy of the children of this world ceases, then the joy of the faithful first really begins; and the ability to rejoice in extreme sufferings, even in death itself, is a proof of the truth and excellence of the Christian religion.

RIEGER:—We ought never to forget the danger of being lost, to which we are exposed so long as we live in a body of sin and death, and amid the temptations of the world; and therefore we ought not to regard ourselves as beyond fear and trembling.—God does not compel and overpower us by His working, like a block. Man can do nothing without God, and God will do nothing

without man and his awakened will.—As surely as God does nothing against His honor, so surely will He do nothing against our salvation.—Doubting is opposed to faith, murmuring, to love. Even now, at the departure of favored children of God, the grace which has been made known in them sweetens perceptibly all sorrow over their loss, and prevents any wish to bring them back again.

GERLACH :—The believing Christian is awakened and moved by God's power. It is mighty in him. But he ought also to give himself up to it without reservation, neither opposing God's will by murmuring, a disposition directly contrary to it, nor concealing his disobedience behind doubts, subtleties, and questions.

SCHLEIERMACHER :—We ought to fear and tremble for ourselves as soon as we perceive the thought of future blessedness becoming dim in our souls, or the longing for it becoming languid in our hearts.—Every one who has such fear of that which may bring upon us adversity, every one who through this fear denies the Redeemer before men, should consider that it was the will of our dying Redeemer that His followers should take His cross upon them as their own. But we can take it upon us only in the faithful and unwearied service of truth and goodness, and of all that we recognize as the will of God.

MENKEN :—The willing is of God and the ability to do is of God; but the using, the action, the life in conformity with such divinely awakened willing and divinely bestowed ability, is ours, is dependent upon us, upon our faithfulness.—He who could think that God indeed works in him the willing but not the performing, or that to-day he gives the willing, but the performing not until after days and years, or even not until the future life, would in that error utter a falsehood concerning God, and would deny Him.—No disposition of heart in which love and faith are wanting accords with the spirit of truth and holiness.—So also no work is good and pleasing to God by which love and faith are injured.—There is something lovely and benevolent about a man who performs every good deed as freely, as joyfully, as kindly, as if it had not been a duty at all, as if no law had enjoined it, no fear compelled it, as if, instead of proving difficult, it had cost no self-denial and no effort, as if it had sprung forth with delight and joy from his very nature, from the rich treasure of his goodness and his love. How ungracious and unlovely on the other hand is every word, and work, and endurance, in which we detect compulsion, secret reluctance, and vexation, an inward, restrained murmuring, that says to us plainly enough: all this would not be done, were it not compelled.—The worth and the good conduct of the child of God should not be the pitiable product of favorable circumstances, not that miserable, godless virtue which is ever dependent on outward circumstances, and changes as often as they change.—The Holy Scriptures contain not an empty, unpractical theory, not a rule for those who dwell in heaven, but instruction for us who live in the midst of the world, who are on the field of battle, and whose life, on account of our own inward character and relation to the world, can be nothing else but a struggle, and who can attain to freedom and peace only through manifold victories.—It was in general characteristic of the Apostle to be moved, awakened, strengthened and exalted by nothing so quickly, so deeply, so powerfully, in the depths of his heart, as by a glance forward to the day of Christ (ver. 16).

HEUBNER :—With real Christians there should be no need of any Mentor, of any higher power whose presence alone could compel them to obedience; they should do the right, no matter whether any one sees or not. With many, doing right is but an eye-service, and with such the law itself is at bottom only one more bugbear.—Christianity does not enjoin anxious scrupulousness and gloomy self-mortification, but it forbids bold assurance and defiant self-confidence. This thought—it is possible for thee to lose thy salvation—can never be fearful enough to us. We should tremble at the idea—it is possible for thee to be cast off from God.—Man must strive as though he could do all, as though all depended on himself. Joy and love in obedience characterize the Christian as a child of God, as a son in distinction from a slave.—Christians should stand in contrast with their age, should constitute the *élite*, and serve as models for others around them.—The fickle sparkle at times; the truly pious burn evenly on.—The service of sin consumes also—but it destroys the best part of the man.

PASSAVANT :—Fear and trembling, before the face of the thrice Holy One; before an unholy world, which ensnares us on every side with the allurements of sin, so that we become partakers of its sins; before ourselves, before this heart which, consciously or unconsciously, joins so readily with Satan and the world in lust and malice, which conceals within itself so many a lust, so many a lie, and so many a power of evil—a manifold tinder of destruction.

MEYER :—Only blessed! is the inscription over every pious Christian's door, as it is over the pastor's study, over font, altar, pulpit, grave. Strive that thou mayest be blessed.—(1) Your salvation *your* care; (2) your salvation *God's* work. The *defiant* heart has heard the admonition to penitence, "work out!"—the *timid* heart the assurance, "it is God!"

IV. SECTION THIRD.

The conduct of the companions and assistants of the Apostle.

(CHAPTER II. 19–30.)

Timothy and his approaching mission to them.

(CHAP. II. 19–24.)

19 But I trust [hope][1] in the Lord Jesus to send Timothy shortly unto you, that I
20 also may be of good comfort, when I know your state. For I have no man like-
21 minded, who will naturally [sincerely] care for your state. For all seek their own,
22 not the things which are Jesus Christ's. But ye know the proof of him, that as a
23 son [child] with the [a] father, he hath served with me in [for] the gospel. Him
therefore I hope to send presently [immediately][2] so soon as I shall see[3] how it
24 will go with me. But I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly.

[1] Ver. 19. [Our English Version often confuses the renderings of ἐλπίζω and πέποιθα with each other. See the notes on Philem. ver. 23, p. 23 (LANGE's Series).—H.].

[2] Ver. 23. ["Presently," by an old English usage="immediately," as in 1 Sam. ii. 16; Matth. xxvi. 53. See EASTWOOD and WRIGHT's *Bible Word Book*, p. 38. This change in the meaning of the English word conceals from the reader the relation in which "shortly" (ταχέως) in ver. 19, and "immediately" here (ἐξαυτῆς) stand to each other.—H.].

[3] *Ibid.* [On the form ἀφιδω, see the EXEGETICAL NOTES below.—H.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 19. **But I hope** (*ἐλπίζω δέ*) in spite of the martyrdom, (*σπενδέσθαι*, ver. 17) which he apprehends. He regards a favorable result as possible, but only because he hopes **in the Lord Jesus** (*ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ*) who is the ground of his hope (1 Cor. xv. 19), so that he is confident of being able to dispense with Timothy, and to send him shortly to them (*Τιμόθεον ταχέως πέμψαι ὑμῖν*). This also took place, since the second epistle was written to him after this. *Ταχέως* is limited by ver. 23. The simple dative *ὑμῖν* is stronger than *πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, not merely equivalent (VAN HENGEL), for the latter is only local, while the former marks his longing for the Philippians—their attachment to each other.—**That I also may be of good comfort**, gives the purpose (*ἵνα*) of the mission; *κἀγώ*, found only here, refers to the effect of the letter in allaying the anxiety of the church concerning Paul, who also needed the same alleviation with respect to them (*εὐψυχῶ*, also found only here), for the church is exposed to many dangers (i. 27-30; iii. 1-21; iv. 2).—**When I know your state.** *Γνούς* indicates definite knowledge, the object of which is *τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν*. He needs and expects to receive through Timothy good news as well as certain information. He ascribes special importance to Timothy's communications, for not only had Epaphroditus been a long time away from Philippi (vers. 25-30), but he wished also to learn the effect of this present letter, and Timothy understood him perfectly, and was aware of all that concerned and interested the Apostle.

Ver. 20. **For I have no man like-minded,** *οὐδένα γὰρ ἔχω ἰσόψυχον.* [The comparison here is between Timothy and other persons, not between him and Paul; since the object of the remark clearly is to state why the Apostle sends Timothy rather than any one else.—H.]. This last reason alone he makes prominent, and hence unfolds it still further.—**Who will sincerely care for your state.** *Ὅστις* describes the character of Timothy: *such a one as that, etc.*, and *ἰσόψυχος* (found only in this place in the New Testament), referring through *ἔχω* to the Apostle, is more closely defined in its mode of action, entirely like *φίλος ἴσος τῇ ψυχῇ μου* (Deut. xiii. 6). *Γνησίως* marks the uprightness and purity, the freedom from false, self-seeking arts, by which he will show his solicitude for them (*τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν μεριμνήσει*) when he comes. The sympathy with which he will enter into their relations and circumstances (*τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν*, not *τὰ ὑμῶν*, 2 Cor. xii. 14), your estate, your possessions. [The verb is future with reference to the concern for them which Timothy would manifest on his arrival among them.—H.]

Ver. 21. **For all** (*οἱ πάντες γάρ*) answers to *οὐδένα*. The article merely denotes a limitation. Those only are referred to who, from their situation being in the Apostle's immediate circle at the time, would be compared with the like-minded (*ἰσόψυχος*) Timothy.—**Seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's** (*τὰ ἑαυτῶν ζητοῦσιν, οὐ τὰ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*), hence do not act sincerely (*γνησίως*). Comp. ver. 4. We are not to think of the hardships of the journey to which they preferred their own comfort (the Greeks), or that *οἱ πάντες* is equivalent to "many," "the most" (GROTIUS, *et al.*), or that they are *Philippensibus cogniti* (VAN HENGEL), or that the

word 'more' is to be understood with ζητεῖν, (ERASMUS), although self-seeking has its gradations. No reference is made to those designated in i. 15, 17. It would not have occurred to Paul to send any of them. Those spoken of in i. 14, might be of the number. Of those mentioned in Col. iv. 10–14; Philem. ver. 24, Demas probably is the only one who was with him. This view seems to be confirmed by the fact that the Apostle cannot send Timothy away immediately (vers. 19, 23).

Ver. 22. **But ye know the proof of him** (τὴν δὲ δοκιμὴν αὐτοῦ γινώσκετε). Timothy was indeed known to the Philippians, and had been with them (Acts xvi. 1, 13; xvii. 14); hence the verb is indicative, not imperative (Vulg., *cognoscite*). On δοκιμήν, *indoles spectata*, see Rom. v. 4; 2 Cor. ii. 9; ix. 13.—The proof consists in this: **That as a child with a father, he hath served with me,** ὅτι ὡς πατρὶ τέκνον σὺν ἐμοὶ ἐδούλευσεν. Instead of saying simply ἐμοί, he proceeds with σὺν ἐμοί in a *variatio structuræ* (WINER's *Gram.*, pp. 422, 577), in order to indicate that he is speaking of a service shared with himself, which is more nearly defined by the additional clause: **for the gospel** (εἰς εὐαγγέλιον), its advancement, (comp. i. 5).

Ver. 23. [By μέν here Paul opposes his sending of Timothy to his own coming as he hopes (δέ, next verse).—Οὖν, *therefore*, since the Apostle would be thus relieved (εὐψυχῶ, ver. 19), and Timothy (τοῦτον) had such qualifications for the service. Both grounds of the inference should be recognized.—H]. What follows here defines more closely the ταχέως in ver. 19. [The "shortly," "speedily" there, is relative with reference to the result of the crisis of which he now speaks as near at hand.—H].—**Him therefore I hope to send immediately,** (τοῦτον μὲν οὖν ἐλπίζω πέμψαι). Τοῦτον sums up the characteristics mentioned in vers. 20, 22.—**So soon as I shall see how it will go with me,** (ὡς ἂν ἀφίδω τὰ περὶ ἐμέ). For the form ἀφίδω instead of ἀπίδω, see WINER's *Gram.* p. 45. It is like ἀφελπίζοντες in Luke vi. 35. The verb, according to its signification, points to the distance (*prospicere*), to see forward to the issue; it indicates his tender anxiety to send Timothy as soon as possible. Ὡς, *as*, in point of time, and with ἄν, *as soon as ever* his relations change, or there is a definite prospect of the issue, one or the other of them will come.—Ἐξαυτῆς sc. ὥρας (Acts x. 33; xi. 11; xxi. 32; xxiii. 30), emphatic limitation of πέμψαι. [He would send Timothy at once on being able to make him the bearer of good tidings. As LIGHTFOOT remarks ὡς ἂν . . . . ἐξαυτῆς is=*at once when.*—H.]

Ver. 24. **But I trust in the Lord** (πέποιθα δὲ ἐν κυρίῳ). Δέ answers to μέν in ver. 23. Although he hopes he will be able to send Timothy, yet he has confidence in the Lord (ii. 19): **That I also myself shall come shortly** (ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ταχέως ἐλεύσομαι); thus not merely Timothy, but he himself will come to them. Comp. i. 25, 26; Philem. ver. 22. [The Apostle expects not only to be set at liberty as Timothy will be sent to inform them, but to be able to use his own liberty for the purpose of coming to them.—H.] Here also there is an alternative, a presentiment of death and a hope of freedom, a wavering between martyrdom and a restored, free activity.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Friends should maintain fellowship with each other even when they are far apart in body. This is essential to the true welfare of each.

2. Letters and messengers are the means of communication, but in each case truth is our ultimate reliance as in personal intercourse, and this is found in its full extent only where there is a deep interest in the cause of Christ, and where selfishness does not reign.

3. Greater than the sorrow for weak and false brethren should be the joy over one *true* friend.

4. Even the apostolic church and the apostles had to suffer from the selfishness which hindered their complete prosperity: perfection is not reached at the beginning but only at the end.

5. Hope and confidence are to be based only upon the Lord, and are justifiable even in time of trouble, even when our hopes are not realized in the form that we expected, when indeed the future is shaped for us in exact opposition to our ideas.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Where love for the brethren is founded on faith in the Lord—the basis of true fellowship—there will a lively hope in Him as the Ruler of the world manifest itself, giving confidence that the course of events shall result in the welfare of the church and of the individual. We see this illustrated in the case of Paul imprisoned at Rome, who, though of a melancholy, choleric temperament, was always hopeful. Candor in judging persons and things is as great as it is rare. It is based on perfect purity. Even the subtlest selfishness pales before it. A teacher in the church, a minister of the word of Christ, has especially to guard himself from selfishness, both in its most refined and its noblest forms.—Hope in the Lord, and hope all that thy heart desires, if it find pleasure in the Lord, but reckon not upon thy heart or thy hope.

STARKE:—Not our own, not our humors, not our desires, but what is Christ's will, the advancement of His kingdom, must we seek as paramount in ourselves and in others, if we would be saved.—Since there is so many 'a slip between the cup and the lip,' we ought to speak cautiously of future events, saying: I hope so, if God will, *etc.* See James iv. 13 ff.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—All special love of one person for another, so far as it is truly brotherly, must be purely Christian.

MENKEN:—Such a man as Paul, in his holy, heavenly disposition, in the quiet, true greatness of his character, in the earnestness, purity and majesty of his life, his willing and his working, could not have many equals.

HEUBNER:—True friendship is rare; for a friendship such as makes two hearts one, requires not merely a similarity of certain general principles in duty and religion, but a similarity of inclinations, sentiments, and of essential principles. No one has more false friends than Jesus. Thus how rare, even among Christ's servants, is an entirely pure, unselfish mind! The coarsely selfish serve their belly, Mammon; the more refined their honor, their system, their school.

2. The return of Epaphroditus to them.

(Chap. II. 25–30.)

25 Yet I supposed it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother, and com-
panion in labor, and fellow-soldier, but your messenger, and he that ministered to
26 my wants. For he longed [was longing] after you all, and was full of heaviness
27 because (that) ye had heard that he had been sick. For indeed he was sick nigh
unto death: but God had mercy on him; and not on him only, but on me also, lest
28 I should have sorrow upon sorrow.[1] I sent him therefore the more carefully
[speedily], that, when ye see him again, ye may rejoice, and that I may be the less
29 sorrowful. Receive him therefore in the Lord with all gladness; and hold such
30 in reputation [honor]: because for the [sake of his][2] work (of Christ) he was nigh
unto death, not regarding[3] [hazarding] his life, to supply your lack of service to-
ward me.

[1] Ver. 27. Ἐπὶ λύπην in A B C D E F, *et al.*; ἐπὶ λύπῃ in K has but slight support.

[2] Ver. 30. The manuscripts give ἔργον alone, or in connection with κυρίου (א A), Χριστοῦ (B), or θεοῦ, also with the article. Probably all the additions are glosses. [For the absolute use of τὸ ἔργον see Acts xv. 38. "The authorities being very evenly divided, neutralize each other. All alike are insertions to explain τὸ ἔργον" (Lightfoot). Ellicott is inclined to retain τοῦ Χριστοῦ.—H.]

[3] Ver. 30. Παραβολευσάμενος in א A B D E F G, *et al.*; παραβουλευσάμενος in C K L, and some other manuscripts. The first *lectio* is the more difficult. See the exegesis. [Meyer, Ellicott, Alford, Wordsworth, Lightfoot adopt παραβολευσάμενος.—H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 25. **Yet I supposed it necessary**—ἀναγκαῖον δὲ ἡγησάμην. Δέ points to the sending of Timothy and the visit of Paul, which may indeed be near at hand, but still are uncertain, more especially Paul's visit. Ver. 26 states the reason for his supposing it necessary to send him.—**Epaphroditus** (Ἐπαφρόδιτον) is not mentioned elsewhere, and is not identical with Epaphras, (Col. i. 7; iv. 12; Philem. ver. 23). [Epaphras had his circuit of labor in Phrygia or Asia Minor (Col. iv. 12), while Epaphroditus, as we see here, had his circuit in northern Greece or Macedonia. The names, however, are not decisive, as they may be different forms of the same name.—H.] The name signifies "lovely," "charming," and was not uncommon (*Tac. Ann.* XV. 55; *Suet. Domit.* § 14). He was no unimportant person to Paul and the Philippians. The Apostle, it will be noticed, commends him very highly.—**My brother, and companion in labor, and fellow-soldier** (*τὸν ἀδελφὸν καὶ συνεργὸν καὶ συστρατιώτην μου*).—The pronoun belongs to all three nouns. The first designates him as the partner of Paul's faith, the second as his partner in office or labor, the third as sharer of his conflicts and dangers; a climax proceeding from a more general to a more definite relationship. On *συστρατιώτης*, see Philem. ver. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 3–5. On *συνεργός* see iv. 3; Col. iv. 11; 1 Cor. iii. 9. On *ἀδελφός* without *ἐν κυρίῳ* (i. 14) see i. 12; iii. 1, 13; iv. 1, 8, 23; Col. i. 1; Eph. vi. 23. —**But your messenger, and he that ministered to my wants.**—Ὑμῶν as emphatic precedes (opposed by *δέ* to *μου*), and belongs to both substantives (*ἀπόστολον καὶ λειτουργὸν τῆς χρείας μου*). The first designates him as the deputy or messenger of the Philippians, as in 2 Cor. viii. 23. It cannot mean here an Apostle (Vulg., Erasmus, *et al.*). The second designates him as the servant of the Philippians, and his errand is more fully defined by *τῆς χρείας μου*, so that we have it stated by whom and for what purpose he was appointed. The word is general in its meaning, as in Rom. xiii. 6, where rulers are called *λειτουργοί*, while in ver. 4 *διάκονος* is used. So also *λειτουργία* in 2 Cor. ix. 12, *λειτουργεῖν*, Rom. xv. 27, have a general signification.—**To send to you** (*πέμψαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, not *ὑμῖν*, as in ver. 19).—The verb does not signify *remittere* (Grotius: *simplex pro composito*). The idea of sending back yields entirely to the idea of sending away.

Ver. 26. **For he was longing after you all.**—Ἐπειδή introduces the reason of his mission (comp. 1 Cor. i. 21, 22; xiv. 16; xv. 21).—Ἐπιποθῶν ἦν πάντας ὑμᾶς marks his constant longing for the whole church and its individual members. An intimate acquaintance with the church and close relation to it are presupposed. Though the Apostle would gladly retain him, yet he is induced to send him to Philippi, lest this longing which had seized him after his sickness, should bring on a relapse in his weakened state. The imperfect is used with reference to the time of their receiving the letter, and of the arrival of Epaphroditus; for at the time of writing he is still in the state of mind described. [Whether he suffered this sickness at Rome, or on his journey from Philippi to Rome, is uncertain. Perhaps the latter view agrees best with the probable interpretation of ver. 30.—H.]—**And was full of heaviness, because ye had heard that he had been sick.**—Καί adds still another reason. Ἀδημονῶν (from ἀ *privativum* and δῆμος, 'foreign,' 'wretched,' like

the German "*elend*," without country, homeless, in distress, as in Matth. xxvi. 37; Mark xiv. 33, the reason of which is: *διότι ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἠσθένησεν*. How the Philippians had heard this, and whence Epaphroditus had received his information, is not known, and is in no way indicated.

Ver. 27. **For indeed he was sick**—*καὶ γὰρ ἠσθένησεν*.—[The *καί*, says LIGHTFOOT, implies that the previous *ἠσθένησεν* understates the case. —H.] This addition confirms the report of his sickness which they had received, and at the same time supplements it: **nigh unto death** (*παραπλήσιον θανάτῳ*). This is an adverbial limitation, but neither elliptical, so that *ἀφίκετο* is to be supplied (DE WETTE), nor a solecism (VAN HENGEL).—**But God had mercy on him** (*ἀλλ' ὁ θεὸς ἠλέησεν αὐτόν*).—His recovery is, in the estimation of the Apostle, first of all an act of grace towards Epaphroditus.—By way of supplement he then adds: **And not on him only, but on me also**—*οὐκ αὐτὸν δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐμέ*. *Δέ* introduces something explanatory, as in ver. 8. and often. See WINER's *Gram.* p. 443.—**Lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow.**—*Ἵνα* introduces the purpose of the *ἠλέησεν*: *μὴ λύπην ἐπὶ λύπην σχῶ*. The *λύπη* which still remains is his bonds, his imprisonment, and consequent suffering (i. 12-26); the other, which has been removed, is the distress occasioned by his companion's sickness and apprehended death. *Si ad vincula accessisset jactura amici* (GROTIUS).—The view that one sorrow (*λύπη*) springs from his sickness, the other from his death, is incorrect (CHRYSOSTOM, ERASMUS, *et al.*).

Ver. 28. **I sent him therefore the more speedily**, *or* **earnestly**, *i. e.*, with the greater despatch (*σπουδαιοτέρως οὖν ἔπεμψα αὐτόν*).—The *οὖν* refers to the recovery of Epaphroditus, and to his intense longing after Philippi, which are the reasons for his speedy departure. With the comparative must be supplied: "than I should have done, had you not been disturbed by hearing of his sickness" (WINER's *Gram.* p. 243). Comp. i. 12.—The Apostle's purpose is: **That, when ye see him again, ye may rejoice** (*ἵνα ἰδόντες αὐτὸν πάλιν χαρῆτε*).—Paul wishes the Philippians to rejoice anew, since their anxiety on account of the illness of Epaphroditus was removed. *Πάλιν* belongs to *χαρῆτε*, since as a rule it stands either before or immediately after the word to which it belongs. See GERSDORF, *Beiträge*, p. 491 sq. It should not be joined with *ἰδόντες*, especially as he was not sent that the Philippians might see him again.—The joy of the Philippians will react upon the Apostle: **And that I may be the less sorrowful** (*κἀγὼ ἀλυπότερος ὦ*).—"There is a delicate blending here of his own interest and sympathy with that of the beloved Philippians" (MEYER); *quum sciam, vos gaudere* (BENGEL). While he is in bonds he cannot be *ἄλυπος*, but yet he is less sorrowful (*ἀλυπότερος*), since the sorrow (*λύπη*) with regard to the anxiety and condition of the Philippians is removed.

Ver. 29. **Receive him therefore in the Lord with all gladness.**—The *προσδέχεσθε*, emphatic by position, requires a reception of Epaphroditus (*αὐτόν*), which shall most fully correspond (*οὖν*) with Paul's purpose in sending him (ver. 28, *ἵνα—χαρῆτε*), and one which shall be worthy of a Christian church (*ἐν κυρίῳ*, and comp. *ἐν κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων*, Rom. xvi. 2); for it should be *with all joy* (*μετὰ πάσης χαρᾶς*), without any admixture of chagrin or discontent on account of the sickness of Epaphroditus, or of his coming too soon or too late.—**And hold such in honor** (*καὶ τοιούτους ἐντίμους ἔχετε*). THEOPHYLACT remarks very justly: *ἵνα μὴ δόξῃ αὐτῷ μόνῳ χαρίζεσθαι, κοινῶς παραινεῖ πάντας τοὺς τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπιδεικνυμένους τιμᾶν*. Yet he has Epaphroditus in view as the individual of the class referred to (MEYER). Hence the suspicion that the Philippians were inclined to undervalue others (WIESINGER, with reference to ii. 3) has no support here.

Ver. 30. **Because for the sake of his work he was nigh unto death**—goes back at once to the person intended. The reception and honor required for Epaphroditus, are based upon (*ὅτι* his work (*διὰ τὸ ἔργον*); for this and nothing else brought upon him the severe illness (*μέχρι θανάτου ἤγγισεν*; and ver. 27, *ἠσθένησεν παραπλησίον θανάτῳ*). Under *τὸ ἔργον* we are to understand, according to the context (ver. 25: *ὑμῶν ἀπόστολον καὶ λειτουργὸν τῆς χρείας μου*; and ver. 30: *τῆς πρός με λειτουργίας*), the commission assigned to him by the church as the bearer of their gifts to the Apostle, and his zeal in the performance of that service. Hence it is not his activity in teaching, *opus a Christo ei demandatum* (VAN HENGEL); or labor for the gospel (SCHENKEL); or the enmity of Nero (the Greek interpreters), both of which are opposed to the context, since ver. 25 designates Epaphroditus as Paul's *συνεργός* and *συστρατιώτης* on account of his office and conduct in general, not especially in Rome, while the latter view contradicts also the history (Acts xxviii. 30, 31). Whether we are to limit his work to his sojourn at Rome (MEYER) may be doubted. Why may it not include his journey also, which certainly was an arduous one?—**Hazarding**, *or* **staking his life** (*παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ*) states the way in which he came so near losing his life. This verb occurs as seldom elsewhere as the other reading (*παραβουλευσάμενος*); yet that (*παραβολεύσεσθαι*) has a less familiar sound than *παραβουλεύεσθαι*, and has also better witnesses, and a sense that offers itself less readily. *Παραβολεύεσθαι* is *παράβολον εἶναι*, "to be a fool-hardy" or "reckless person," as *περπερεύεσθαι* is *πέρπερον εἶναι*, "to be a boaster, braggadocio" (1 Cor. xiii. 4). See WINER's *Gram.* p. 93. *Τῇ ψυχῇ* is dative of the respect in which (WINER's *Gram.* p. 215). It is his life, not money, property, time, which he put at hazard, or (to keep nearer to the word) squandered. We see in this prodigality the measure of his zeal. Whether the season of the year, his haste, means of travel by land and water, were concerned in the case, is not indicated, is simply unknown. *Παραβουλευσάμενος* would mean *male consulens vitæ* (LUTHER), since he regarded his life so lightly). TISCHENDORF. (ed. VII. maj. II. p. 473) compares CÆSAR (*Bell. Gal.*): *adeo esse perterritos nonnullos, ut suæ vitæ durius consulere cogantur*, and the verbs *παραφρονεῖν*, *παραλογίζεσθαι*, and finds this rendering the more suitable, because there is then only *temeritas*, not guilt, in a holy work. Yet we are the less to assume the re-

proach of a censurable *temeritas* in παραβολεύεσθαι, from the fact that the watchers by the sick* in the ancient church were named *parabolani* (from παραβάλλεσθαι, whence παράβολος and then παραβολεύεσθαι, are derived); yet certainly the name implied no reproach, but was meant solely to recognize their fearless courage. The conclusion states the object of the participial clause.—**To supply your lack of service toward me**. Ἵνα introduces the motive for such exposure (παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ) which is that he *might fill up*, (ἀναπληρώσῃ), *etc.* Parallel to this is 1 Cor. xvi. 17: ὅτι τὸ ὑμέτερον ὑστέρημα αὐτοὶ ἀνεπλήρωσαν. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 9; Philem. 13; also Col. i. 24: ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The verb denotes not merely filling, but filling *usque ad oram*, and being emphatic by position, gives prominence to the act. The object is τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα, which differs from τὸ ὑμέτερον ὑστέρημα, by bringing to view the lack of personal ministration as defined by the genitive (τῆς πρὸς με λειτουργίας). The service (λειτουργία) according to the expression itself, and the context, is the pecuniary relief or supplies which the Philippians could not bring and present in person, but were obliged to remit through Epaphroditus. Luther: "in order that he may serve me in your stead." The apostle finely and delicately views the absence of the Philippians as a deficiency in that service, and bespeaks their grateful sympathy in the affliction of their delegate who had performed his mission with equal courage and skill (MEYER). [In designating the absence of the Philippians in the presentation of their gift as something which was wanting to make it complete, he expresses no censure, but shows merely his affection for those of whose personal intercourse he found it so painful to be deprived, (SCHENKEL). — H.] Hence it is incorrect to join ὑμῶν with λειτουργίας, to understand this last word in general of every service (RILLIET: *les services, dont j'avais besoin*) in disregard of the limitation furnished by the context, or even as *res necessariæ*, and τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα as *defectus qui subvenitis* (HÖLEMANN.)

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The best men and Christians often show a union of opposite virtues; for example, Epaphroditus. The finest delicacy of soul, which if alone might seem excessive and effeminate, allies itself to a manly courage, which sets at naught life itself. The deepest love of the church does not exclude a most faithful attachment to its great Apostle, nor anxiety for the present moment forbid sympathy for a distant community. One may reverence and acknowledge superior men, and yet give all the glory to God alone; may be anxious for his own soul, and yet give himself to the welfare of the church, and the common service of its membership.

2. God looks not upon the individual merely in his sorrow. Every instance of God's help is an act of His compassion for the sake of others, as well as of the sufferer; because we are members together, and have joy whenever God causes any one member to rejoice.

3. [REV. J. TRAPP:—Epaphroditus was sick nigh unto death, and Paul distressed on that account. This should not have been if St. Paul could have cured him, as he did others. This shows that the Apostles cured the sick, and did miracles, not by their own power, or at their own pleasure, *etc.*—H.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

All that thou doest with respect to others regard as a duty which the Lord Himself demands of thee. By the faithful performance of duty, rightly apprehended, thou dost promote the welfare of those with whom God has placed thee. — Above all be a brother to thy neighbor, and thou wilt be his helper not in joys and labors alone, but also in suffering and victorious endurance. Observe how clear a vision true Christian love has in all our relations, even the most difficult, and how strong it is even in the most trying times. The thread which we are to grasp, to hold firm, never escapes its sight; nor does strength to do what is right, and what is salutary, and beautiful, and lovely at the same time, fail its arm. Whether God's hand smites thee or preserves thee, still feel the pity of the Father's heart which stretches out the arm and lifts the hand.

STARKE:—Neither nature nor grace produces stoics, unsusceptible men; but the susceptibility of friendship, which already exists between kinsmen and friends, is sanctified and perfected by grace.—Unbelief looks to nature and medicine as the only remedies in sickness; faith looks to the providence of God also, by virtue of which He comes to the aid of man's nature, as well as of medicine and care, with a special influence and blessing.—When believers look upon one another, they see also the inner, renewed nature, through the covering of the outer man; and because a tender love exists between them, the sight of each other refreshes, quickens them.

RIEGER:—We must not expect grace to lift us above all alternations of feeling into a state of entire tranquility.—It is a mistake to suppose that one must be equally well equipped at all times. Even in the holy soul of our blessed Saviour there were changes of feeling.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—At the bottom of all love between individuals there must be love for the entire body to which they belong as living members; on the other hand, this love for the whole body is the consequence of affection for the individuals.

MENKEN:—One might think that this tenderness of feeling on the part of Epaphroditus went almost too far; on the contrary, we are to notice also here that one possessed of such extreme sensibility may yet be a strong man, and that a very tender heart may nevertheless be a very firm heart. It was not a trifling act for a Chris-

* [The most natural supposition is that Epaphroditus brought upon himself this sickness, which was so nearly fatal, in consequence of some special exposure on the journey, or of the fatigue incident to travelling with such despatch, in his impatience to reach the Apostle. It does not comport so well with our ideas of Paul's character to ascribe it to his "anxious attendance on the Apostle at Rome" (ELLICOTT). Paul did not exact, hardly was willing even to accept, such self-denying services from others. For exemplifications of Paul's delicate regard for the safety, health and comfort of others, the reader may see Dr. HOWSON'S *Lectures on the Character of St. Paul*, pp. 78-83 (London, 1864).—H.]

tian, one of a sect everywhere spoken against, everywhere hated and oppressed, which found no protection under Jewish or Gentile rule, to travel from Philippi to Rome in order to carry aid to a Christian teacher, an Apostle, yea, the hated and now imprisoned Paul, over whose approaching death his enemies were already rejoicing, and take his stand publicly before the world, by the side of this man, and say, "I am his friend."—They knew that by faith and prayer one can move heaven and earth, but they did not regard faith and prayer as amulets, or talismans, that are able to expel all darkness and distress from a Christian's life, and to raise him above all humble waiting on God's help, above all subjection of his own will to God's will.

HEUBNER:—Life, especially the life of a faithful servant of Christ, possesses great value. For such a life we ought to pray; and it is an act of God's grace when it is preserved to the church.

PASSAVANT:—If one were separated ever so completely from all other men, still he is a warrior and combatant, since in his own heart are the worst enemies of his heavenly peace.

V. SECTION FOURTH.

Warning against Judaistic teachers and wicked deceivers.

CHAPTER III. 1—IV. 1.

1. *The disposition of these teachers in contrast with that of the Apostle.*

(CHAP. III. 1–16).

(1) The Apostle warns his readers against the disposition of these false teachers, especially their pride (2-7); points out plainly the opposition between righteousness which is of the law and that which is of faith (8-11); declares with humility that he is yet striving after perfection (12-14), and concludes by exhorting them to unity (15, 16).

1 Finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord. To write the same things to you, to
2 me indeed is not grievous, [irksome] but for you *it is* safe. Beware of [the] dogs, be-
3 ware of [the] evil workers, beware of the concision. For we are the circumci-
sion, who worship (God) in the Spirit [of God[1]] and rejoice [glory] in Christ
4 Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh. Though I might [can] have
confidence (also) in the flesh. If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he
5 might trust in the flesh, I more: circumcised[2] the eighth day, of the stock of Israel,
of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pha-
6 risee: concerning zeal,[3] persecuting the church; touching the righteousness which
7 is in the law, blameless. But what things were gain to me, those I [have] counted
8 loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless, and I count all things (but) loss for the ex-
cellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the
loss of all things, and do count them (but) dung [refuse] that I may win
9 Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the
law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of
10 God by [upon] faith; that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection,
11 and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable[4] [being conformed]
unto his death: if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.[5]
12 Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow
after, that I may apprehend [lay hold upon] that for which also I am apprehended
13 [was laid hold upon] of [by] Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have
apprehended[6] [to have laid hold upon] but (this) one thing: (*I do*,) forgetting
14 those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are be-
15 fore, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Je-
sus. Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in anything
16 ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless,
whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule,[7] let us mind the
same thing [in the same let us walk].

[1] Ver. 3. Θεοῦ is found in ℵ A B C, and most of the authorities, whereas θεῷ has but slight support, and is evidently a correction. [The evidence, says TISCHENDORF, is clearly on the side of the former.—H].

[2] Ver. 5. [The approved text is περιτομῇ and not the nominative περιτομή. See the notes below.—H].

[3] Ver. 6. ζῆλος has the support of ℵ A B D* F G, *et al.* A few manuscripts have ζῆλον. Is it a copyist's error (comp. 2 Cor. ix. 2. MEYER)? The passage here would seem rather to require τὸ ζῆλος in 2 Cor. ix. 2, [instead of ὁ ζῆλος, masculine. See WINER's *Gram.* p 65].

[4] Ver. 10. Συμμορφιζόμενος is found in ℵ A B, *et al.* On the other hand, συμμορφούμενος (E K L, *et al.*) and συνφορτειζόμενος (F G, *et al.*), *cooneratus*, have but slight support.

[5] Ver. 11. Τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν, is well attested by ℵ A B D E *et al.*, better than τῶν νεκρῶν, and need not appear strange after ἐξανάστασις, though Paul has elsewhere ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν. [See the exegetical notes *infra.*—H].

[6] [Apprehend meant formerly "to take in the hand," or "by the hand" (a Latin sense of the word). Thus Jeremy Taylor (*Holy Living*, ii. 6) says: "There is nothing but hath a double handle, or at least we have two hands to apprehend it."—H].

[7] Ver. 16. Στοιχεῖν, for which συνστοιχεῖν also occurs, has after it κανόνι, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, in ℵ C, but in some other copies has the words before it, while in others again the words appear only in part. No doubt ii. 2, and Gal. vi. 16, have led the copyists to change the text for the sake of uniformity.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Finally** (*τὸ λοιπόν*) as *formula progrediendi* begins (BENGEL) as in iv. 8; Eph. vi. 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; 1 Thess. iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 1), a section usually near the end. Hence in the glow of feeling the Apostle always adds "my brethren" (*ἀδελφοί μου* or *ἀδελφοί*). It does not conclude what immediately precedes (SCHENKEL), nor does it so necessarily indicate the end, that ver. 2 follows as a digression (MEYER).—**Rejoice in the Lord** (*χαιρετε ἐν κυρίῳ*). This is of the first importance, and corresponds with the ground-tone of the letter (see Introd. §§ 1, 2, p. 4; and comp iv. 4; ii. 17, 18, 28; i. 18, 25). Their joy should have its origin and element in Christ (Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Thess. i. 6). That the emphasis falls upon this expression is shown by the final exhortation (iv. 1) *στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ* (iv. 2), which lies at the foundation of that given here, and appropriately follows the warning against the false teachers who would separate them from the Lord.—**To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not irksome but for you it is safe** (*τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν ὑμῖν, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐκ ὀκνηρόν, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀσφαλές*). We infer from *ὀκνηρόν* (from *ὄκνος* 'sluggishness,' 'delay,' like *πονηρός*, *qui aliis πόνους facit*), which in Matt. xxv. 26; Rom. xii. 11, signifies 'slothful,' that an unpleasant task is meant, and that may consist in a formal repetition of his words. Ἀσφαλές (from *σφάλλω*, *labo*, *vacillare facio*), properly "firm, secure," (Heb. vi. 19; Acts xxi. 34; xxii. 30; xxv. 26), or 'adapted to secure,' 'make safe,' presupposes warnings against imminent dangers. It is clear that Paul, 'who writes the same things' (*τὰ αὐτὰ γράφει*), only for the sake of the Philippians, would prefer not to be compelled to do so; it is, therefore, no feeling or confession of poverty of thought (BAUR). It is also evident that *τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν* does not refer to consolation, exhortation, which would not be to him burdensome (*ὀκνηρόν*). Hence it is not the preceding exhortation to rejoice that is meant (BENGEL, WIESINGER, and others). Both adjectives lead us to think of the warning as directed against false teachers in Philippi. But in this letter Paul as yet has written nothing about these teachers, since those mentioned in i. 15, 17 sq. are in Rome and may be endured, whereas those here are of the most dangerous character. It is most natural to think of another letter of Paul's to Philippi, especially as POLYCARP says of Paul (Phil. iii.): *ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς, εἰς ἃς ἐὰν ἐγκύπτητε δυνήσεσθε οἰκοδομεῖσθαι.* He also says in another passage (Phil. ii.), preserved only in a Latin translation: *Ego autem nil tale sensi in vobis vel audivi, in quibus laboravit beatus Paulus, qui estis in principio epistolæ ejus, de vobis enim gloriatur in omnibus ecclesiis.* The meaning of this is not: "Ye are in the beginning of his letter," but according to 2 Cor. iii. 1-3: "Ye are from the beginning, in the beginning, his letters, letters of recommendation." Why may not an epistle to the Philippians have been lost, as well as that to the Laodiceans (Col. iv. 16), and one to the Corinthians (BLEEK, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1830, p. 625; WINER's *Realw.*; p. 673)? The view that *quæ præsens dixeram* should be supplied (PELAGIUS, ERASMUS, and others) is untenable; for he does not say *καὶ γράφειν*, nor can we suppose, with HEINRICHS and PAULUS, that from *τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν* to iv. 20, we have an *esoteric* letter to his more intimate friends, while the remainder is an *exoteric* letter to the church. This is an arbitrary notion, and does not help us at all to explain the language; "it is a manifest historical and psychological misconception," says MEYER, "if we only think of Paul's relations to the Philippians." [Paul had been at Philippi twice after his founding of the church there (Acts xx. 1, 2) where this city must have been among "those parts" mentioned in that passage, and again on his return to Macedonia after the three months in Greece, (vers. 3, 6); and on these occasions he must have given to the Philippian Christians much and varied oral instruction. The *γράφειν* as present will bear the emphasis—"to be writing as I now do"—and this could be opposed to the warnings which they had heard from his lips, when among them. The act of dictating and writing to them would thus be tacitly opposed to the easier task of merely speaking to them. He would submit cheerfully (*οὐκ ὀκνηρόν*) to the trouble of repeating his instructions in every form, with the pen or the voice, if he could only by such or any other means secure them against the dangers to which they were exposed. So, among others, CALVIN and WIESINGER. Prof. LIGHTFOOT understands the expression as referring to the Apostle's reiterated warnings against dissension in this letter, and Bishop ELLICOTT of his exhortations, expressed or implied, to rejoice in the Lord.—H.] In *χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ* we see Paul's aim, in *οὐκ ὀκνηρόν* his readiness, in *ἀσφαλές* the church's danger and want, and in *τὰ αὐτά* (not *τὸ αὐτό*) the variety or compass of his teachings.

Ver. 2. **Beware of [the] dogs, beware of [the] evil-workers, beware of [the] concision.** *Βλέπετε*, followed as here by a direct accusative, strictly means 'behold,' 'fix your eye upon;' and so in 1 Cor. x. 18; i. 26. See WI-

NER's *Gram.*, p. 223. The proper Greek for 'beware of' would require ἀπό with the genit. after βλέπετε (Mark viii. 15; xii. 38). The one sense here involves the other; *videte et cavebitis* (BENGEL). The threefold repetition marks the Apostle's earnestness and the importance of the warning (WINER's *Gram.*, p. 609), while it corresponds *gradatione retrograda* (BENGEL) to the three clauses (ver. 3) which describe only a single class of teachers, and hence not three different kinds of false teachers (VAN HENGEL). The first substantive (τοὺς κύνας) was a term of reproach with heathen and Jews, and implies 'impudence, shamelessness' (in Matt. xv. 26, τοῖς κυναρίοις, less severe); among the Jews it (κύνας) implied also uncleanness (Matt. vii. 6; Rev. xxii. 15), and among the heathen that of ferocity and malevolence. It is most natural to retain here the biblical idea, *viz*, profane, impure, shameless, thereby indicating the moral character of the teachers in question. Hence it is not to be understood of mere shamelessness (CHRYSOSTOM), or this together with covetousness (GROTIUS), or ferocity or violence (RILLIET), and least of all a special class: *homines a Christi professione ad Judæorum superstitionem reversi, imitatores canum ad vomitum suum redeuntium* (VAN HENGEL). Τοὺς κακοὺς ἐργάτας designates their activity, not as πονηρόν, evil to others, but as evil in itself, unprofitable, injurious (comp. δόλιοι ἐργάται, 2 Cor. xi. 13). See the contrast in 2 Tim. ii. 15. VAN HENGEL is incorrect: *qui se a Christo quidem non avertunt, sed superstitione illa divinam corrumpunt doctrinam.* Τὴν κατατομήν, *paranomasia nam gloriosam appellationem* περιτομῆς *vindicat Christianis* ver. 3, κατατέμνα *de concisione vetita*, Lev. xxi. 5; 1 Reg. xviii. 28; *non sine indignatione loquitur* (BENGEL). See WINER's *Gram.*, p. 638. The language here states the result of their activity; with their circumcision they effect only an outward mutilation. This ironical and sarcastic *paranomasia* (found often in Paul as well as in LUTHER) marks only the quality, not the quantity (BAUR), of the circumcision, and is to be taken passively in its concrete sense, *i. e.* the mutilated, not the mutilators. The reference is not to idolatry (BEZA, *et al.*), or to a separation of faith from the heart (LUTHER), a sundering of the church (CALVIN, *et al.*), and still less to a class of teachers: *Judæi, fiduciam suam in carnis circumcisione potentes atque ita ad Christum venire nolentes, sed illum contemnentes et spernentes* (VAN HENGEL). It is certain that they were Judaists, as in Galatia, and were active at Philippi, and though they had no success and no adherents at Philippi, yet were dangerous opponents of Paul's view of Christianity. The severity of the Apostle's language contrasts strongly with his joy and friendliness with reference to the Philippians, but was justified by the fact that a spiritual field so fair and hopeful was threatened and endangered by such disturbers. The condition itself of the church furnished a reason for his sharpness against them. The contrast in ver. 3 sheds further light on this point.

Ver. 3. **For we are the circumcision** (ἡμεῖς γάρ ἐσμεν ἡ περιτομή). *Causa, cur*, ver. 2, *alios tam longe secludat* (BENGEL). [Paul justifies here (γάρ) his refusing to recognize the Judaists as the advocates of true circumcision. They are destitute of the marks of those who answer to that character. They substitute an outward form for the spirit of true worship, and rely upon their own works for acceptance, instead of the righteousness offered to them in the gospel; whereas the circumcision that God accepts is that of the heart and not of the letter (Rom. ii. 29), and is the seal or evidence of the justification which man obtains by faith and not by deeds of the law (Rom. iv. 11 sq.). Christians fulfilled both of these requisitions for obtaining the favor of God, and hence they also were entitled to be called the circumcision.—H.] Ἡμεῖς precedes with emphasis. The Apostle means himself and his beloved church, which was composed for the most part of Gentiles. Hence ἡ περιτομή is to be understood in the purely spiritual sense, that is, Christians who have received circumcision of the heart (Col. ii. 11; Rom. ii. 25–29). Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. iii. 28; v. 6; vi. 15.—These are further characterized: **who worship in the Spirit of God** (οἱ πνεύματι θεοῦ λατρεύοντες). The verb is used absolutely, as Heb. ix. 9: x. 2; Acts xxvi. 1; Luke ii. 31, of the worship of God which the instrumental dative defines more fully as spiritual, and the genit. θεοῦ refers to the Holy Spirit in opposition to the human spirit. It is contrasted with the σάρξ in its moral sense. Comp. John iv. 23, 24; Heb. ix. 14; Gal. iii. 3; Rom. xii. 1 (τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν). Hence the dative does not designate the rule (VAN HENGEL). WINER's *Gram.*, p. 216. Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 7.—**And rejoice [glory] in Christ Jesus** (καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ). For the form of expression see Rom. ii. 17: v. 11; 1 Cor. i. 31; iii. 21; 2 Cor. x. 17. They are here contrasted with the κακοὶ ἐργάται.—**And have no confidence in the flesh** (καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες) denotes their moral position as opposed to the κύνας, the impure, insolent, while that which precedes marks their religious sphere. Οὐκ implies a direct negative: *qui non confisi sunt*, whereas μή would have made it hypothetical (*si non confisi sunt*). See WINER's *Gram.*, p. 485.

Ver. 4. **Although I might have** (more strictly **am having** = **have**) **confidence also in the flesh.** Καίπερ is restrictive here only in Paul, more frequently in the Epistle to the Hebrews (v. 8; vii. 8; xii. 17). Ἐγώ singled out from ἡμεῖς, ver. 3 (the truly circumcised whether outwardly or not), places the Apostle, who is a Jew as the false teachers were (ver. 2), not one of the heathen as was the greater part of the Philippian Church, in contrast with these teachers, as having confidence in the flesh (ἔχων πεποίθησιν ἐν σαρκί) *de jure*, not *de facto*. His actual confidence is based not upon the flesh, upon outward advantages, but upon Christ (hence καί before ἐν σαρκί, *i. e.*, also in *it* as well as Him), though not without his reasons for that other confidence and a right to it. Hence the participle does not denote the past (VAN HENGEL), nor is it to be resolved into 'could have' (SCHENKEL), nor is πεποίθησις merely *argumentum fiduciæ* (BEZA, CALVIN, *et al.*). In σαρκί special reference is made to circumcision. [This rite is named because it was the watchword, as it were, of those who, in their system of salvation, exalted good works above the merits of Christ (see

Gal.)—H.]—**If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more,** introduces a comparison between Paul's condition and that of the others. Ἐι τις ἄλλος is entirely general, leaving his readers to apply it to the Judaists. Δοκεῖ denotes the subjective, arbitrary judgment, as in Gal. vi. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 18; viii. 2. No appeal can be made to Gal. ii. 6, 9 (SCHENKEL), for there the meaning is 'to be found such by others, to have that repute.' Πεποιθέναι ἐν σαρκί denotes the actual πεποίθησιν ἔχειν, contained in the perf. With ἐγὼ μᾶλλον we are to supply δοκῶ πεποιθέναι ἐν σαρκί; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 23.

Ver. 5. Now follow the specifications which justify this claim. His first advantage is: **Circumcised the eighth day** (*περιτομῇ ὀκταήμερος*). The dative (not nominative, as if the abstract were used for *circumcisus* (BENGEL), which is true only in the collective sense) denotes the respect in which (Eph. ii. 3: *τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς*). WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 215. The adjective designates Paul in contrast with proselytes, as a Jew by birth, who had been circumcised on the eighth day, according to the law (Gen. xvii. 12; Lev. xii. 3).—*In censum nunc venit splendor natalium* (VAN HENGEL), the second advantage: **Of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews** (*ἐκ γένους Ἰσραήλ, φυλῆς Βενιαμίν, Ἑβραῖος ἐκ Ἑβραίων*). These all belong together according to the sense and the construction, for the preposition is not repeated before *φυλῆς*. As SCHENKEL well remarks: The theocratic full-blood (Rom. xi. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 22) is contrasted with the Idumean half-blood. Comp. Eph. ii. 12. The tribe of Benjamin enjoyed and conferred a distinction, because unlike the Ephraimites it had remained faithful to the theocracy. Besides this his Jewish extraction (*εὐγένεια*) was also perfect: his mother also was a Jew, and not a foreigner. It is incorrect to understand this of Hebrew-speaking parents (the Greek interpreters), which the context does not support, or of a *tota majorum series ex Ebræis* (GROTIUS), which would be unnecessary if he sprung from the people of Israel, from the tribe of Benjamin.—The third advantage: **As touching the law a Pharisee.** *Κατά* denotes the reference, as *τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* (Eph. vi. 21). WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 401. Comp. Acts xxii. 3; xxvi. 5. His religious position, his relation to the law, is marked as strict, rigorous; for the Pharisees observed it conscientiously and scrupulously. *Νόμος* is not = *αἵρεσις*, *disciplina*, *θεσμοί* (GROTIUS and others).

Ver. 6. The fourth advantage: **Concerning zeal, persecuting the Church** (*κατὰ ζῆλος διώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*) describes his moral conduct in the relations above mentioned. The participle is to be taken substantively as *οἱ ζητοῦντες* in Matt. ii. 20. It is not equivalent to *διώξας* (GROTIUS). That which is the greatest sin of the Apostle's life, in his own estimation (1 Cor. xv. 8, 9; 1 Tim. i. 13-16), he reckons by a sort of irony in this controversy with the Judaizers, as a glory to himself.—The fifth advantage: **Touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless** (*κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ γενόμενος ἄμεμπτος*) presents the moral result. The righteousness referred to here (as the result of his conduct) is that which rests in the law, is based upon and determined by it; hence essentially that which is *ἐκ νόμου* (ver. 9), and not 'righteousness under or in the condition of law' (DE WETTE). In this respect he is 'blameless' (*ἄμεμπτος*) according to men's judgment (*communi hominum existimatione*, CALVIN). It does not fully embrace Paul's meaning to say: *se nihil fecisse, quod morte aut verberibus castigandam esset* (GROTIUS). *Γενόμενος*, put for emphasis before the adjective, signifies '*becoming*, striving himself to be,' upon which, as the context teaches, he places value in the presence of God, but only when he opposes the carnal pride of these false teachers. To find here an obvious, though weak and lifeless imitation of 2 Cor. xi. 18-27, and to call this passage tame and without interest (BAUR), indicates a perverted taste (MEYER).

Ver. 7. **But what things were gain to me,** presents forcibly Paul's own position in contrast with (*ἀλλά*) that of these teachers. In *ἅτινα*, *quæcunque*, which is emphatic as the following *ταῦτα* shows, are included the preceding privileges and others of the same class.—These formerly *ἦν μοι κέρδη*, **were actually gains,** as the verb, emphatic by position, indicates. By *μοί* Paul means himself, as when he was Saul of Tarsus, and there is no need of weakening the sense by taking the pronoun (*μοι*) as the dative of judgment (ERASMUS, *et al.*) The plural *κερδή* is used *ob rerum varietatem*, but there is no reason for supplying *non vera lucra, sed opinata* (VAN HENGEL) which is no more implied in the plural than in *μοί*, since *ἦν* precedes.—**These [have] I counted loss for Christ** (*ταῦτα ἥγημαι διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν ζημίαν*). The perfect, after the emphatic *ταῦτα*, denotes an *actio præterita, quæ per effectus suos durat*, and implies the inward decision which has resulted in action. It does not refer to the act in itself, but to the act as a result of conscious freedom. Hence it is not *abjeci, repudiari* (VAN HENGEL), which ii. 3 does not confirm. Both the collocation and the signification of the words are to be observed. As to the order, we notice that *διὰ τὸν Χριστόν* stands between *ἥγημαι* and *ζημίαν*: Christ must first be known, then the *ταῦτα* are esteemed *ζημία*. With respect to the words we remark the following: (1) that with the accusative *διά* marks the reason (WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 398); (2) that *τὸν Χριστόν* denotes the well known, historical Christ, and (3) that *ζημίαν* calls to mind Acts xxvii. 10 (*πολλῆς ζημίας οὐ μόνον τοῦ φορτίου καὶ τοῦ πλοίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν*), and ver. 21, where reference is made to what had been thrown into the sea. Hence it is *jactura*, after the figure of a merchant who throws his *κέρδη* overboard, as *ζημίαν*, in order to save his life. The various kinds of gain (*κέρδη*) are esteemed as one loss of life, so far as these (*ταῦτα*) separate and keep one away from Christ.

Ver. 8. **Yea, doubtless, and I count all things loss.** *Ἀλλά* contrasts the present (*ἡγοῦμαι*) with the perfect (*ἥγημαι*). *Μέν rem præsentem confirmat, οὖν conclusionem ex rebus ita comparatis conficit*, (so also MEYER) and *καί* connects the present with the preceding perfect. WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 442. [The stricter translation according to this view, is: 'But therefore also I count,' *etc.* The present (*ἡγοῦμαι*) reaffirms his

former judgment: He has still the same view of the worthlessness of all reliance on outward forms and privileges.—H]. The contrast does not lie in πάντα (Rilliet), for this only embraces the ἄτινα in its widest scope.—The reason why he thus holds all things to be 'loss' (ζημίαν εἶναι) the subsequent clause unfolds: **For the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord** (διὰ τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου μου). The explanation which belongs to διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν does not lie in the relation defined by the preposition (that being simply repeated), but in that with whom it effects the relation. The substantive participle (τὸ ὑπερέχον) designates in comparison with those gains (κέρδη) one of far surpassing value, which results from a knowledge (τῆς γνώσεως) of the Redeemer both in His Person (Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ) and in His relation to each individual (τοῦ κυρίου μοῦ). Calvin wrongly takes it *ad exprimendam affectus vehementiam*.—**For whom I have suffered the loss of all things.** [It is the aorist in Greek, 'suffered,' which refers to the definite epoch in Paul's life when he experienced the change in his views and relations which he here describes.—H]. In δι' ὃν he returns again to the person of Christ, on which, after all, everything depends, not on the subjective knowledge. Τὰ πάντα, where the article recalls πάντα just mentioned, is the limiting accusative after the passive ἐζημιώθην, which states a result consequent on this altered view of his character and wants. Luther incorrectly renders it: 'I have counted loss;' and Van Hengel: *cujus causa factum est, ut me illis privarem omnibus*.—But the Apostle has not merely endured this passively, for he adds: **And do count them refuse that I may win Christ.** Καὶ ἡγοῦμαι indicates his activity, conviction, knowledge, the ground of which is still *for whom* (δι' ὃν). Σκύβαλα (from κυσὶ βαλεῖν) εἶναι marks the absolute worthlessness more strongly than ζημίαν εἶναι which concedes a relative value: *ζημία, jactura fit æquo animo, σκύβαλα properi abjiciuntur, posthac neque tactu, neque adspectu dignanda.* (Bengel). [Another derivation is that from σκῶρ, σκατός, 'dung,' 'filth,' which some good etymologists adopt, though the other is generally preferred.—H]. The aim and purpose of such a judgment is ἵνα Χριστὸν κερδήσω, *that I may gain Christ*, who replaces all losses.—The future does not exclude present possession, but yet implies a fuller appropriation, which the present does not satisfy. *Χριστόν* is stronger than simply *Christi favorem* (Grotius).

Ver. 9 attaches itself closely to that which precedes.—**And may be found in him**, καὶ εὑρεθῶ ἐν αὐτῷ. Bengel well observes: *qui omnia, ne se ipso quidem excepto, amittit, Christum lucrifacit et in Christo lucrifit; Christus est illius et ille est Christi. Plus ultra loquitur, Paulus quasi adhuc non lucrifecerit.* It is incorrect to take the objective gaining of Christ (ἵνα κερδήσω) placed emphatically after the subjective, *i. e.*, the being found (εὑρηθῶ) opposed to ἡγοῦμαι, as equivalent to *sim*, (Grotius) or to restrict it to *judicum dei* (Beza). How he will be found is stated in what follows.—**Not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law.** Μὴ is used with ἔχων in the first place, because it belongs to a final clause, but also because it expresses a judgment concerning Paul: 'as one who does not have.' See Winer's *Gram.*, p. 482 sq. Van Hengel incorrectly joins it closely with εὑρέθω: *ut deprehendar in ejus communione non meam qualemcunque habere probitatem*, while Rheinwald and others explain it as 'holding fast.' It is *habens* as a specific modal-limitation of εὑρέθω ἐν αὐτῷ.—Ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου describes the righteousness (δικαιοσύνην) under two aspects: first, ἐμήν, emphatic by position, corresponding to τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοσύνην (Rom. x. 3) 'his own,' 'self-acquired,' to which is opposed ἡ ἐκ θεοῦ or ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom. x. 3); secondly, τὴν ἐκ νόμου with reference to the medium, as in like manner δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως (Rom. iii. 26) and answering to τὴν διὰ πίστεως (comp. Rom. iii. 21, 22, 26; iv. 5; ix. 32; x. 3, 5, 6).—Hence he at once adds to the latter the opposite characteristic. **But that which is through the faith of Christ**, ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ. Here righteousness (*i. e.*, of faith) is described as the *causa apprehendens* or means of securing the benefits of Christ's work.—But for the sake of completeness he now adds still under the antithetic ἀλλά: **The righteousness which is of God upon faith** (τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει). It is not a righteousness proceeding from the subject, but from God (*causa efficiens*), which rests on faith as its basis. The article τῇ renders the *gen. objecti* (Χριστοῦ or εἰς Χριστόν), and the article τήν before ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει unnecessary, because this limitation is immanent in the conception as the faith-righteousness. Winer's *Gram.* p. 135. Meyer incorrectly connects this clause (τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ, *etc.*) with ἔχων, and Schenkel, with εὑρέθω ἐν αὐτῷ. So remote a connection is itself against both views. We reject also the following: *In fide* (Vulg.), *per fidem* (Grotius), *propter fidem* (De Wette), *conditione hujus ipsius fidei posita* (Van Hengel).

Ver. 10. **That I may know him** (τοῦ γνῶναι αὐτόν). This knowing of Christ is what the righteousness of faith proposes, without which such knowing is impossible, in the possession of which therefore he would be found, that he may be able to know Christ. In like manner in Rom. vi. 6, one clause with ἵνα is joined to another with τοῦ and the infinitive. Thus the process of the knowledge of Christ (ver. 8) is given. Calvin, Bengel, and others, join this clause incorrectly with ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει. The excellence of this knowledge lies first of all in its object, the person of the Lord, a practical, experimental acquaintance with Him. What follows αὐτόν is epexegetical.—**And the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings** (καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ). The first denotes the *vis et efficacia* which the resurrection of Christ has upon those who know Him, which they experience when they embrace by faith the resurrection of the Lord; whereby God declared Him to be the author of justification and righteousness to all and every one who believes, (Rom. iv. 25; viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 17; 2 Cor. ii. 14; iv. 10, 11; Col. iii. 1, 2). Hence the new life, the striving for that which is above, the conversation in heaven (ver. 20), spring up in and with the righteousness of faith. Hence ἀνάστασις is not to be regarded as *exortus* (Bengel);

or δύναμις to be understood as the power which effects the resurrection (GROTIUS); nor is reference had to the certainty of our resurrection and exaltation (HÖLEMANN, *et al.*) The other expression, τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ, indicates a participation in the sufferings of Christ, a συμπάσχειν (Rom. vii. 17. See Gal. ii. 20: Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι; 2 Tim. ii. 11) a suffering for Christ's sake and in fellowship with Him. Thus suffering alone does not lead to glory as dying does not save or make us blessed. With Him! But as there is no resurrection without death, so also is there none without suffering (WIESINGER). Hence this thought, which logically should come first, takes the second place, emphatically intimating that the second is something not to be overlooked if one desires the first. The reference is not merely to a similar disposition in suffering (VAN HENGEL), or to an appropriation by faith of the merit of Christ, (CALOV), nor is it to be explained as if it were written τὴν δύναμιν τῆς κοινωνίας (HÖLEMANN). These two things, the power of the resurrection of Christ and the fellowship of His sufferings, are objects of the knowledge which only the righteous by faith possess. Hence such knowledge transcends all other advantages (ver. 8). —**Being conformed unto his death**, συμμορφιζόμενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ. The nominative with τοῦ γνῶναι, without its relation to the subject being more closely defined is unusual. It would properly be the accusative of the subject, but is a *constructio ad sensum*, as if it had been ἵνα γνῶ. Comp. John viii. 54; and for the opposite construction Acts xxvii. 10. WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 572; see on Eph. iv. 2. The present participle points to an incipient present accomplishment, which the verb shows to be outwardly similar to the death of Christ. Paul had been exposed in the cause of the gospel more immediately to a violent death, at the hands of the heathen in league with the Jews; he might at length die a martyr's death. It is not therefore to be carried forward beyond the nearer clause, to which it actually belongs, to one more remote, which has its own limitations; nor does it denote a condition yet to be attained, or an inward ethical relation of likeness to the death of the sinless Redeemer (SCHENKEL).

Ver. 11. **If by any means** *or* **perchance**, εἴ πως, *si forte*, denotes a hope which naturally connects itself with what has been said of the power of the resurrection of Christ, of fellowship with His sufferings, and of the Apostle's, own impending death by martyrdom. The problematical form of the expression shows his humility in view of the glory which is the object of this hope. We are not to suppose any hesitation, or doubt, but only the exclusion of moral certainty.—**I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.** Καταντήσω as in Acts xxvi. 7. Εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν is simply the resurrection of the righteous to blessedness. The first preposition in the substantive ἐξανάστασις, found only here, (the verb ἐξαναστήσαν in Mark xii. 19; Luke xx. 28; Acts xv. 5), points to the place whence the dead come forth (ἐκ τῆς γῆς). BENGEL hypercritically refers ἐξανάστασις to the resurrection of Christians, and ἀνάστασις to Christ's resurrection. Our passage gives no support to the distinction between a first and second resurrection. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 23; 1 Thes. iv. 16. ["The general resurrection of the dead," says Prof. LIGHTFOOT, "whether good or bad, is ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν (*e. g.*, 1 Cor. xv. 42); on the other hand, the resurrection of Christ and of those who rise with Christ, is generally [ἡ] ἀνάστασις [ἡ] ἐκ νεκρῶν (Luke xx. 35; Acts iv. 2; 1 Pet. i. 3); the former includes both the ἀνάστασις ζωῆς and the ἀνάστασις κρίσεως (John v. 29); the latter is confined to the ἀνάστασις ζωῆς." To infer that the righteous only are to be raised at the last day would contradict the express declaration of Christ in John v. 26–29; and of Paul in Acts xxiv. 14, 16.—H]. VAN HENGEL'S view is singular: *si forte perveniam ad tempus hujus eventi, hence: live to the time when the dead shall rise.*

Ver. 15. **Not that I have already attained [laid hold of] or am already [or have become] perfect.** Οὐχ ὅτι guards against the error of supposing that Paul would say of himself ἤδη ἔλαβον ἢ ἤδη τετελείωμαι. The object of ἔλαβον is not named, hence is to be drawn from the context: τὸ γνῶναι αὐτὸν (ver. 10), τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (ver. 8). Ἔλαβον naturally denotes complete, secure possession; as if he were entirely penetrated by such knowledge, and it had entirely penetrated him, as if it had accomplished in him its perfect moral effect. The explanatory τετελείωμαι defines the meaning. With this modest literal account of his experience we are not to connect the figurative βραβεῖον in ver. 14, which does not come forward till after the intervention of several other clauses (the Greek interpreters, BENGEL, MEYER, and others); and also not τὴν ἀνάστασιν (RHEINWALD). *jus ad resurrectionem beatam* (GROTIUS), καταντᾶν (MATTHIES), all of which belong to the future, or Χριστόν (THEODORET), moral perfection (HÖLEMANN). BENGEL well remarks: *in summo fervore sobrietatem spiritualem non dimittit apostolus.*—**But I follow after if I may also apprehend [lay hold of] that** (διώκω δέ, εἰ καὶ καταλάβω). Διώκω means (as in Rom. ix. 30; 1 Cor. xiv. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 22) *studiosi appeto*, in contrast with (δέ) ἔλαβον, and having the same object. The εἰ shows the striving to be with humility. Καί points back to ἔλαβον; καταλάβω is stronger: *cum quis plene potitur* (BENGEL); laying hold firmly (MEYER). Comp. Rom. ix. 30: 1 Cor. ix. 27.—**Because also I was apprehended [laid hold of].** The ground on which he hopes to lay hold of (ἐφ᾽ ᾧ), as in Rom. v. 12; 2 Cor. v. 4 (WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 394), hence equivalent to διότι. It is inappropriate to supply τοῦτο as the object of καταλάβω, **for which**, καὶ κατελήμφθην ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ (RILLIET, WIESINGER, and others); for the Apostle's thought relates not so much to the reciprocal acts of 'laying hold,' and 'being laid hold of,' as to the effectual initiative which Christ has taken; and equally out of place is the idea of 'being laid hold of for Christian perfection.' The tone of the passage, which is not dialectic, reflective, speaks against such interpretations as: 'under the condition,' (MATTHIES), *quo ut pervenire possim* (GROTIUS). LU-

THER's rendering is unphilological. 'After that,' and CALVIN's *quem ad modum.* We are to recognize a suggestive and fine allusion in *κατελήμφθην* to the manner of Paul's conversion (Acts ix. 3 ff.). [This reference appears to me doubtful.—H.]

Ver. 13. **Brethren,** *ἀδελφοί. Familiariter fatetur* (BENGEL). **I count not myself to have laid hold of,** *ἐγὼ ἐμαυτὸν οὐ λογίζομαι κατειληφέναι.* A repetition of ver. 12, which emphatically excludes himself (Acts xxvi. 9; John v. 30, 32; vii. 17; viii. 54). The perfect as distinguished from *καταλαβεῖν*, denotes the having laid hold and kept hold. He resolutely discards all certainty and self-conceit, not so much on account of his readers and of their conduct (ii. 2-4), as WIESINGER thinks, but for their sakes in view of false teachers among them, or who might appear among them.

Ver. 14 answers to ver. 12 *b.* **But one thing,** *ἓν δέ*, introduces the antithesis of *οὐ λογίζομαι;* hence we are to supply *λέγω* (LUTHER), or *λογίζομαι κατειληφέναι* brought forward; for what follows he maintains to be true of himself in opposition to what he has denied to be so. There is no ground for inserting *ποιῶ* (BENGEL, WINER's *Gram.*, p. 620, *et al.*); nor *διώκω* (VAN HENGEL). Ἓν refers to the whole following sentence, not merely to one member of it, *viz.*, the two participial clauses (MEYER).—**Forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark,** (*τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω ἐπιλανθανόμενος, τοῖς δὲ ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεκτεινόμενος κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω*). The finite verb, as in ver. 12, is first of all defined more closely by two participles, which stand emphatically before it. The first clause is negative: 'forgetting that which lies behind;' the second is positive: 'reaching out to what lies before;' the first designates a purely spiritual act; the second describes a spiritual act by the posture of the body. Ἐπεκτεινόμενος indicates the bent-forward posture of one stretching himself out towards an object. BENGEL: *Oculus manum, manus pedem prævertit et trahit.* The concrete expressions (*ἔλαβον, διώκω, καταλάβω, τὰ ὀπίσω, τὰ ἔμπροσθεν, ἐπεκτεινόμενος, σκοπόν*) gradually pass over more and more into the figure of a runner who in view of the goal before him and in thinking of the prize, forgets the space that lies behind. At first these expressions are such as readily attach themselves to the figure—perhaps it already lay at the bottom of them—in the end they are borrowed directly from the figure, so that *τὸ βραβεῖον* naturally follows as a part of the description. Hence in *τὰ ὀπίσω* the reference is not to the advantages mentioned, vers. 5, 6 (PELAGIUS, *et al.*), for these as attributes of the flesh (*σάρξ*) must be given up before the race begins, nor is it to the labors of the apostleship (THEODORET), but to the past attainments of the Christian life (MEYER). Τὰ ἔμπροσθεν, according to the figure the space yet to be traversed, is the life: future experience, not the goal itself, which is pointed out by *κατὰ σκοπόν.* The dative (*τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν*) shows upon what the gaze is fixed, while the preposition (*κατά*) indicates the direction, so that the goal is always thought of beyond the intermediate steps: it is thus = goalward (MEYER), *versus metam* (WINER's *Gram.*, p. 400).—**For the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.** Εἰς τὸ βραβεῖον presents now the object towards which his thoughts and efforts are directed. See 1 Cor. ix. 27; comp. Col. iii. 15. How the genitive *τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* is to be understood, a due attention to the subject and the figure shows. By *ἡ ἄνω κλῆσις* is meant the heavenly calling (Heb. iii. 1: *κλῆσις ἐπουράνιος*) in opposition to *τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* (Col. iii. 2), and as usual *κλῆσις* denotes an action (Eph. i. 18; iv. 1, 4; Rom. xi. 29; 2 Tim. i. 9; 2 Thes. i. 11; 1 Cor. i. 26; vii. 20). If its nature and character are thus determined, so now is its author (*τοῦ θεοῦ*). Comp. 1 Thes. ii. 12. The medium is presented by *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* (WINER's *Gram.*, p. 135 sq. Comp. Col. i. 4.) To connect this clause with *διώκω* (CHRYSOSTOM, MEYER) is against both the sense and the construction. Accordingly *τῆς κλήσεως* is genitive of the subject, which holds forth *τὸ βραβεῖον*, but not the genitive of apposition (SCHENKEL). [On the games of the Greeks and Romans, from which the Apostle has drawn his illustration, see GAMES in Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible.* —H].

Ver. 15. **Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded.** Ὅσοι οὖν τέλειοι begins the practical application as an inference (*οὖν*) from the preceding. Τέλειος is to be distinguished from *τετελειωμένος: ille, cursui habilis, hic, brabeo proximus, jam jam accepturus* (BENGEL). The first word designates a character or condition objectively determined without measuring its subjective development or degree; whereas the second determines the measure of that growth or progression. It designates like *ἅγιος* (Eph. i. 1) the Christian state of which the context treats, ver. 12 (*τελείωσις*), Heb. vii. 11. See 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Matth. v. 48; Col. iv. 12; Jam. i. 4; iii. 2; Heb. v. 14. "As the *ἅγιον εἶναι* is the strongest obligation to *ἁγιωσμός*, so the *τέλειον εἶναι* presents the strongest incentive to strive after the *τελειοῦσθαι*" (WIESINGER). The nature or extent of the perfection (*τέλειοι*) appears in vers. 9, 10. The question is one not of absolute, but only of relative perfection. Οὖν points back to the entire passage (1. 14), not merely to 12–14 (MEYER). By *ὅσοι* each individual is left to judge for himself whether he belongs to the *τέλειοι* or not. There is no reason for understanding the expression as ironical, and since he includes himself, as self-irony (SCHENKEL). Nor can the Apostle refer to intelligence only (GROTIUS, *et al.*), for the point under remark is the righteousness of faith. Hence, too, a comparison with immature believers or beginners in the Christian life, *νήπιοι* (1 Cor. ii. 6; iii. 1; xiv. 20; Heb. v. 13, 14) as MEYER supposes, is irrelevant. Τοῦτο φρονῶμεν has reference to the moral disposition. BENGEL: *hoc unum* (ver. 14). Unlike the false teachers the church should be of the same mind as the Apostle. The reference is not to *τὸ βραβεῖον* (VAN HENGEL); the point in question is the true way of striving after the *βραβεῖον.*—**And if in anything ye be otherwise minded,** (*καὶ εἴ τι ἑτέρως φρονεῖτε*) supposes a case in which the members of the church differ among themselves in their views or spirit in regard to points which are incidental or formal, and not essential, (it is *ἑτέρως*, not *ἕτερον*, as if to distinguish between form and substance), but

still not rightly, as surely might be the case according to i. 9–11. The context does not indicate in any way how this has taken place.—Those of whom Paul speaks are not *νήπιοι* (*aliter ac perfecti*, BENGEL) nor those who have been led astray (GROTIUS); nor yet are the errors entirely indifferent (SCHENKEL), for *ἀποκαλύψει* authorizes a hope of correction or recovery; nor is it: *si quid boni per aliam viam expetitis* (VAN HENGEL).—**God shall reveal also this unto you** (*καὶ τοῦτο ὁ θεὸς ὑμῖν ἀποκαλύψει* is a confident hope, not a wish (LUTHER). *Καί* also points to other things that He has already revealed The verb indicates an immediate disclosing to the human spirit by the Spirit of God, which next to the teaching (*διδάσκειν*) of the church men need in order to understand ethical truth. See Eph. i. 17.

Ver. 16. **Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk in the same.** [For the rendering of this verse, see remarks on the text.—H]. *Πλήν* (as in i. 14; and iv. 14) limits the hope by a *conditio sine qua non*, which is *εἰς ὃ ἐφθάσαμεν τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν*. The infinitive as in German: '*nur—wandeln!*' is to be construed as an imperative (WINER'S *Gram.* p. 316), but not connected with *ἀποκαλύψει* (ŒCUMENIUS), or with what follows (RILLIET). The verb, according to its derivation from *στοῖχος*, *row*, *order*, (from *στέχω*, to ascend), signifies 'to walk with and after one another,' and is construed with the dative (Gal. v. 25, *πνεύματι*; vi. 16, *τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ*; Rom. iv. 12, *τοῖς ἴχνεσιν*). Hence the meaning of *τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν* is: 'to walk together with each other according to or in the same.' *Τῷ αὐτῷ* is more closely defined by *εἰς ὃ ἐφθάσαμεν*. This verb means to arrive at, to reach, hence has to do with an act completed at a definite time, which the tense marks as belonging to the past, while the act denoted by *στοιχεῖν* is continuous, reaching from the present into the future. The common rule by which they are to act is that which they have experienced or gained in the Christian life—the gospel, truth, Christ, God's Spirit and life—and indeed in its entire range as the indefiniteness of the expression indicates. Thus there is no reference to the *βραβεῖον*, or any single thing, and the sense is: Should energy become even violence; mildness, softness; earnestness, stubbornness; reserve, exclusiveness; fidelity, narrowness; freedom, laxity; in any one point (all which is *τὶ ἑτέρως φρονεῖν*), only hold fast to the gospel, the Lord and His word, to the essential truth of the same, to that of which we have become partakers.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Christianity plants and nourishes essentially and chiefly joy, true joy, joy in the Lord, in His word and work, His life and gifts, His excellence and glory.

2. Irony and humor in sacred things (ver. 2: *κατατομή—περιτομή*) hold almost the same place that the imprecatory Psalms hold among the prophetic; the former invoke on the enemies of God and His kingdom what the latter predict. Irony and humor are an expression of the difference which exists between reality and truth, a difference sharply recognized and as sharply uttered, without mercy for the delinquent, but with a tender regard for those who are to be instructed. They occur especially in the style and thoughts of genial men distinguished for faith, at the same time full of deep earnestness as well as tender love, like Paul and Luther (whose *Dreckel Dreckketal*, instead of *Dekret Dekretal*, MEYER compares here with Paul's sarcastic paranomasia). They are to be distinguished from *ridicule* which only seeks to provoke laughter against one, and thus to achieve a petty triumph, and from derision and scorn which have their origin in contempt. It is not an allowed ridicule or scorn—allowed to an Apostle, even a duty, but in general to be condemned (SCHENKEL)—that is here employed. The greatness of the danger and of the interests at stake, the hot struggle at an endangered post, a true and lively sense of justice, the deepest sympathy with those for and around whom the contest is raging, and great spiritual keenness, sagacity, and depth of feeling, occasion the hard, telling, crushing expression (see ver. 3).

3. Two things are as important as they are difficult: to determine the *extent* of one's advantages and gifts, and the *worth* and relation of the same. Birth and lineage, family, tribe and nationality on the one hand, and the moral character determined by them on the other; Paul reckons together as excellencies and gifts of the same kind, and holds them all in slight esteem compared with what he has in Christ. The morality of men belongs to the province of the natural life; it depends on birth, family, position, culture, time and circumstances, and gives reason, as does every favor for humble thankfulness, but not for proud boasting (vers. 3-5).

4. The righteousness of faith has its advantage over righteousness of the law in the author to whom it owes its origin, that is God Himself; in the *medium* through which it is wrought, faith which embraces and clings to the Mediator; and in the *experiences* which it works, and which reach into the eternal glory, that is, Christ's life and sufferings, with whom the believer has sympathy (ver. 10).—The worthlessness of the righteousness of the law does not consist in this, that law and advantages, such as birth, family, nation, morality, are in themselves valueless, but in the fact that man of himself, the natural man, without Christ, in his perverseness, does not rightly estimate them (ver. 7-9, and Rom. vii. 7-24).

5. Progress consists in advancing from the possession of faith to that of knowledge, which is not merely an intellectual thing, but an experience of the whole man, a transforming of impressions into views or judgments, and then onward through suffering with Christ to glorification with Him who perfects His servants even as He completed His own course. The first points out the material or means of progress, the second its form or sphere, while the end is the permeating of the entire man by the dead and again risen Lord (vers. 11–14).

6. The progress of the Christian to eternal glory has its *origin* in the fact, that he has been called from above by God in Christ, and has been laid hold of by Him; its *continuance* in the fact,

that he holds firmly to Christ without contentedly looking back upon what has been already won, but with his face earnestly set towards the goal with the feeling that he has not yet reached it; and its *end* in the fact, that the exalted Lord receives him into His glory. It is thus an onward movement in one direction, without elation or depression, or a deviation to the right or left (vers. 13, 14). To him belongs the χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ who obeys the στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ (iv. 1).

7. He who has the truth-loving heart will never want the helping guidance and revelation of the Spirit of truth; and as certainly will he have his waverings and his need of this help (vers. 15, 16).

8. [It seems appointed that much of the highest instruction should come to us (even in the Bible) through the sufferings and struggles of individual men. *Perseverance in the Christian life* is, after all, the basis of St. Paul's character. "I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air; but I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." "Not as though I had already attained, but I follow after. This one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." (Dr. Howson's *Lectures on the Character of St. Paul*, p. 212 f.)—H].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Warn thy hearers constantly by holding up before them first of all what the Lord commands, and by leading them to observe what they have lost, and by whom they have been deprived of it. —Never glory in the gifts of the Lord, but only in the Lord of the gifts.—Do not leap over the valley of sorrows through which the way to the heights of glory passes.—Thou art never complete, never think thyself complete; what thou hast and art is ever less than what thou shouldest have and be.—Far-seeing, circumspect, self-inspecting, watch all waverings in thyself, that thou mayest not depart from the one way of salvation.

Luther:—Thoughtless, full, surfeited souls, if they have once heard a word of God's, act as if it were an old thing, and yawn for something new, as if they were able to do all that they have heard. This is a dangerous plague and wicked artifice of the devil, who thereby renders men confident, secure, over-curious, and ready for every error and schism; and they are guilty of the vice of slothfulness (ἀκηδία) in the service of God (ver. 1).—Flesh and blood say: Something new, else it becomes tiresome. Nay, says Christ, but *think of me.* The word of God rightly received into the heart, produces neither fulness nor satiety, but greater desire the longer it is known (ver. 1).

Jerome Schurf:—*Sic mutatam et corruptam esse ecclesiæ doctrinam, quia concionatores existimarint gloriosum esse, non repetere eadem, sed alia et nova afferre redeuntibus iisdem festis.*

Starke:—God has no respect of persons; before Him the slave has as much worth as the master, the peasant as the noble, the subject as the prince. We see this, indeed, in death, which is God's provost, who uses even justice, and punishes the master with the slave.—It is a humility which becomes those to whom God has lent many talents, and who have also increased them by usury, to act as if they knew it not, and so to give God all the glory.—To boast of one's race, lineage, rank, and external advantages, is a vain ostentation; but we may well praise those on account of their family and descent, who also possess the faith and virtues of their ancestors.—False prophets may perhaps be blameless in their outward walk; but without circumcision of the heart, it is only a coat of whitewash over an old, unsightly wall.—Righteousness of the law is good, but it does not merit blessedness, which is bestowed as a gift only through faith in Christ.—Whoever fancies that he has advanced so far in Christianity that he needs nothing more, may perhaps in God's school hardly sit upon the lowest form. Christians have ever to be learning, and cannot finish their education during their entire life (ver. 15).—In religious matters we ought not to depart a hair's breadth from the prophetic and apostolic doctrine; and thus many errors may be prevented.

Rieger:—As with the two scales of a balance, when one rises the other falls; and what I add to one, diminishes the relative weight of the other; so as one adds to himself he takes away from the pre-eminence which the knowledge of Christ should have. What he concedes to Christ makes him willing to abase himself, to resign all confidence in his own works. Therefore the sharp expressions, 'to count as loss, as dung,' become in experience not too severe; for to reject the grace of Christ, to regard the great plan of God in sending His Son, as fruitless, were indeed far more terrible (ver. 8).

Gerlach:—The inner and outer life of the Christian upon earth, is a life of suffering in the sorrow which he feels for the sins of others, for his own, and for the distress of others, and for the oppression, conflicts, and even apparent defeats of the children of God. These sufferings are the sufferings of Christ Himself, not merely similar to His; He bears them with His members. His conflicts and their conflicts are the same; it is one cause for which, and one strength in which, they strive; it is one victory and one crown which He has won, and which He gives to them (ver. 10).—'What is behind' signifies in this figure not merely the world and sin, which we have forsaken, but also our own virtue, the actual progress which we have made, on which we are prone to dwell with self-complacency, and so to become unmindful of our great deficiencies and sins (ver. 14).—True Christian perfection, therefore, in this world, the token of a mature Christian, is that, certain of his election in Christ he yet does not regard himself perfect, but painfully perceives the wide space which still intervenes between the righteousness imputed to faith and the sanctification of his entire heart and life, and unceasingly strives to reach the goal.

Schleiermacher:—Are now the expression of the Apostle John, "Little children, love one another," as he explains it, and the expression

of the apostle Paul, "Rejoice in the Lord," one and the same? And are both such that one can say of them with confidence, that they never weary the speaker, and that they always strengthen the hearer?

MENKEN:—The ever recurring exhortation of the apostle to rejoice in the Lord, was adapted to assure them that Christianity is something bright, cheerful, and joyful, to make them certain, confident in their knowledge and walk in opposition to those who imagine that one must mix a bitterness, narrowness, and legal servitude with the mildness, breadth and freedom of the new covenant and its gospel.—There is no one among us, however limited his powers may be, whose weakness and incapacity may not be changed into wisdom and knowledge; his timidity into firmness and fearlessness; his hardness and unloveliness into gentleness and amiability, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. Hence the Christian religion is vastly different from human morality.—The choice of the best part is never repented of.—As in the life of the body the question is not whether the man will breathe or not, whether he will make use of the light that is in the world to see or not; but as it is understood, that according to the laws of nature he must breathe, if he will live, and must open his eye to the light, if he will see; and as there is no way of supporting life outside of the atmosphere, and no medium for perceiving the world of matter, except the light; so is there no other way of becoming partakers of the divine light and life except Christ, and no room for the question whether man can do without Christ or not.—All men are under sin and death, and no one comes to the divine light and life, to his own source and end—to God, except through Christ.—The forgiveness of sins is not indeed deliverance from sin, but it is the sure pledge and earnest of future complete deliverance, and is necessary, and must form the beginning.

HEUBNER:—The preacher should not be ever thinking of something new, but of what is useful, edifying. The Sophists made it a charge against Socrates that he repeated the same things.—Lavater's principle of saying at least something in every sermon, which he was certain he had never said before, *i. e.*, something that he had never before spoken either so plainly, or so urgently, or with such a particular application (though the kernel of the sermon must always be the same) is not at variance with that of the Reformers; for they also do not exclude variety in the contents, or diversity in the form of the sermon.—Spiritual sloth may creep over even the converted, so that the Bible becomes dull to them. Bunyan himself complained of this.—What a vast difference between blamelessness before God, and legal blamelessness before men! How can one deceive himself therein!—How many an ecclesiastic buries himself in his studies, while he might be sowing seed for eternity by oral instruction, visits, and the teaching of children. The more earnest in conversion and sanctification, the humbler is our state of mind, and clearer our knowledge of our imperfections, because we then first see and understand how lofty and distant is this goal of perfection, and how great is the work of sanctification. The Christian does not please himself with the conceit that he has already laid hold of, or attained it; this folly is far from him.—The influence of grace is mighty, but not irresistible.—The most advanced Christian thinks least of himself.—The Christian is not yet in quiet possession; he should not rest on his laurels.—The Christian knows that he is ever in arrears, and so long as there are debts still remaining, so long must he also work.—I look not back like Lot's wife towards the Sodom I have left, nor long like the Israelites after the flesh pots of Egypt. Both kinds of looking back are idle and ruinous, for they make us slothful, they lead to unfaithfulness.—Perfect Christians, in the proper sense of that language, are those who know the goal and the way thither, *i. e.*, Christ, and have begun with earnestness to press towards it.—The hope of spiritual growth is conditioned on fidelity, conscientiousness, and adherence to known truth.

PASSAVANT:—Every one who will not deceive God or himself knows in his own heart out of what darkness the light broke forth with him, and out of what darkness old and new, it has long continued to break forth.—Paul forgets what is behind, *viz.*, three things: 1) those objects of pride which he formerly regarded as gain and glory; 2) the sins of his past life in general, and especially the many and great sins which he had committed as a persecutor and blasphemer of the Church; and 3) his progress hitherto in the new divine way of life.

AHLFELD:—The genuine warrior of Christ may not stand still: 1) he knows that he has not yet obtained the prize; 2) in the pursuit of it he never becomes weary; 3) he journeys towards the city of God, having the same mind as his brother.

HARLESS:—Three great foes of Christian and social virtue; 1) the conceit of being perfect; 2) the weakness of looking back; 3) obstinacy and destructiveness of self-will.

LEHMANN:—True progress in the Christian life. 1) From what *origin* must it proceed? Laid hold of by Christ! 2) By what *rule* must it shape itself? I have not yet obtained! 3) What *end* must it seek? The prize of the heavenly calling (vers. 12-14).

[ROBERT HALL:—As every person either has, or expects to have some spring of joy or source of consolation, there is nothing which so much determines our character as *that* from which we expect this to rise. So if we wish to know ourselves we must examine where this spring or source lies.—We see from the Apostle's account of his experience, that it is very possible for a person to have great zeal for modes, and forms, and ceremonies, and yet be totally ignorant of the spirit of true religion. Real religion is one thing; an attachment to forms and ceremonies another. We may be very zealous for one particular creed, opinion, sect or denomination, and with the credit and conceit of our wisdom yet be very defective in the Christian spirit. This temper leads to malignity of feeling. There may be sufficient in such religion for us to hate one another, but not enough to cause us to love each other. Let us "worship God in spirit, rejoice in Christ Jesus," and be taught to value the great truths and promises of the Gospel as all in all (vers. 1, 2, 6).—H].

(2). *The destiny of false Christians in contrast with that of true believers.*

(Chapter III. 17—IV. 1).

17 Brethren, be followers together of me [become imitators of me] and mark them
18 who walk so as ye have us for an ensample. For many walk, of whom I (have)
19 told you often, and [but] now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of
the cross of Christ; whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose
20 glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things. [1]For our conversation [citizen-
21 ship] is in heaven; from whence also we look for the [a] Saviour the Lord Jesus
Christ; who shall [will] change [transform] our vile body [the body of our hu-
miliation], that it may be fashioned like[2] unto his glorious body [the body of his
glory], according to the working whereby he is able even [also] to subdue all
IV. 1 things unto himself.[3] Therefore, my brethren dearly beloved and longed for,
my joy and crown, so stand fast in the Lord, my dearly beloved.

1 Ver. 20. [The γάρ here has the support of all the oldest manuscripts, though the passage is cited by many early writers, as if δέ was the connective.—H].

2 Ver. 21. Before σύμμορφον some *codices* insert εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτό, manifestly an interpretation.

3 *Ibid.* ℵ A B *et al.* have αὐτῷ. A few copies read ἑαυτῷ [adopted in the received text.—H].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 17. **Brethren, become imitators of me,** *συμμιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί.* 1 Cor. iv. 16: *μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε.* They are to look to the Apostle, to follow him, with him to act on the principle of following the light which they have (*τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν*, ver. 16). This result is not achieved at once, but by degrees (hence *γίνεσθε*, '*become*'). The *συν* refers to the Apostle's associates, as is evident from what immediately follows (Theophylact: *συγκολλᾷ αὐτοὺς τοῖς καλῶς περιπατοῦσιν*). [The "associates" are those whom the Apostle would have the Philippians to imitate, together with himself (*τύπον ἡμᾶς*); and the import of *συν* more naturally is='be ye all a company of imitators' (Ellicott).—H]. Hence it is not: *una cum Paulo* (Bengel), *omnes uno consensu et una mente* (Calvin), or superfluous (Heinrichs). *Brethren, ἀδελφοί,* indicates the fervor of the appeal.—**And mark them who walk so,** (*καὶ σκοπεῖτε τοὺς οὕτως περιπατοῦντες*) associates others with Paul, who are models for the church, since they walk as he does.—**As ye have us for an ensample** (*καθὼς ἔχετε τύπον ἡμᾶς*) embraces Paul and those who walk like him. Ἡμᾶς is thus neither Paul alone, especially as it stands after *μου*, while besides, we should have in that case *ἔχουσιν*, instead of *ἔχετε*, nor Paul and Timothy (Schenkel), nor Paul and all approved Christians (Matthies), nor *ut ego meique socii* (Van Hengel). The singular (*τύπον*) is found not only where one is spoken of (1 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. ii. 7), but also in regard to a plurality (1 Thes. i. 7; 2 Thes. iii. 9). In 1 Pet. v. 3 *τύποι* occurs where several are meant. The singular here indicates that they all present the same image, belong to the same category. In *καθὼς* lies unquestionably an argumentative force='in the measure' (Meyer).

Ver. 18. The Apostle confirms his exhortation by two contrasts (vers. 18–21).—**For many walk** (*πολλοὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦσιν*), since there are many wicked persons who strive to lead others astray, consider us, not them. [They should heed his expostulations the more because there were so many (*πολλοί*) whom they could not safely imitate. "The persons here meant are not the Judaizing teachers, but the anti-Roman reactionists. This view is borne out by the parallel expression, Rom. xvi. 18: *τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Χριστῷ οὐ δουλεύουσιν ἀλλὰ τῇ ἑαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ,* where the same persons seem to be intended; for they are described as creating divisions and offences (ver. 17), as holding plausible language (ver. 18), as professing to be wise beyond others (ver. 19), and yet not innocent in their wisdom: this last reproach being implied in the words *θέλω δὲ ἡμᾶς σοφοὺς εἶναι εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀκεραίους δὲ εἰς τὸ κακόν.* They appear therefore to belong to the same party to which the passages vi. 1–23; xiv. 1—xv. 6, of that epistle are chiefly addressed. For the profession of "wisdom" in these faithless disciples of St. Paul, see 1 Cor. i. 17 sqq.; iv. 18 sqq.; viii. 1 sqq.; x. 15" (Lightfoot). See the remarks on ver. 18.—H]. Περιπατεῖν is not neutral here as in 1 Pet. v. 8, *circulantur* (Heinrichs), 'go about' (Meyer). It could not stand absolutely after *οὕτως περιπατοῦντες.* Paul wishes to describe more closely the moral walk of those in question, but he is led away from the adverbial construction by the first relative clause, and proceeds in relative clauses to speak of the end, motive, and character of this walk. Hence neither *κακῶς* (Œcumen.) nor *longe aliter* (Grotius), is to be supplied, nor is the concluding limitation (*οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες*) to be joined with the verb to relieve the difficulty (Calvin); nor are we to assume that since *περιπατοῦσιν* in itself needs no qualifying term, the sentence proceeds with en-

tire correctness with the subjoined limitations of the subject (MEYER). Those, whose example the Philippians should shun (πολλοί) are according to the entire description members of the church, not false teachers, as in iii. 2; at the most they are those who, led astray by such teachers, have become in turn corrupters of others.—**Of whom I told you often, but now tell you even weeping,** (οὓς πολλάκις ἔλεγον ὑμῖν, νῦν δὲ καὶ κλαίων λέγω.) [The imperf. shows the habit=" was accustomed to speak of." This is an instance of Paul's repeating in his letter what he had said in person when he was among the Philippians. See the remarks on ver. 1. The Apostle in this passage, refers evidently to his former warnings, when he was at Philippi.—H]. To understand the remark of passages in the letter itself (iii. 2; i. 15), is untenable; for these here are different persons from those referred to in the passages mentioned. To πολλοί corresponds πολλάκις. Why he now weeping repeats that which he had formerly said without tears, is well explained by CHRYSOSTOM, ὅτι ἐπέτεινε τὸ κακόν. [The evil in the meantime had become more serious.—H]. He writes with deeper emotion, with streaming eyes.—**That they are the enemies of the cross of Christ** (τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) we are to join with οὓς ἔλεγον. [On this construction see WINER's *Gram.*, p. 530.—H]. Paul thus designates those to whom the cross is an offence or foolishness; formerly they may have been Jews or heathen, but now they are Christians, who wish to know nothing of the "fellowship of Christ's sufferings," (κοινωνία τῶν παθημάτων Χριστοῦ, ver. 10), to whom the 'sufferings of Christ' (παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 2 Cor. i. 5) are offensive, who are not willing to suffer with Him, (συμπάσχειν, Rom. viii. 17), nor allow the world to be crucified to them and themselves to the world (Gal. vi. 14), nor crucify their flesh together with its lusts and desires (Gal. v. 24). The Apostle is speaking of immorality of life, ethical errors, while ver. 19 (ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία) indicates an Epicurean, careless life (ἐν ἀνέσει ζῶντες καὶ τρυφῇ, CHRYSOSTOM). No reference is made to their doctrine of the cross (THEODORET); or even to theoretical errors, or intellectual misconceptions. The reference is not to those who are not Christians (RILLIET) or *hostes evangelii* (CALVIN).

Ver. 19. **Whose end is destruction** (ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια) is first mentioned. *Hoc ponitur ante alia, quo majore cum horrore hæc legantur; in fine videbitur. Finis, ad quem cujusvis rationes tendunt, ostendit sane, quæ sit ejus conditio* (BENGEL). Ἀπώλεια, the opposite of σωτηρία (i. 28) is passive. BENGEL incorrectly regards *salvator* as the equivalent term, and HEINRICHS takes the meaning to be: their end is to destroy Christianity. The end is described by τὸ τέλος (2 Cor. xi. 12–15) as their own peculiar, appointed end.—**Whose God is their belly,** (ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία). The belly is termed their God, as being their highest concern, the master whom they serve (Rom. xvi. 18). Κοιλία from κοῖλος, *cavus*, is *venter* (Matt. xv. 17; Mark vii. 19; Luke xv. 16) *uterus* (Luke i. 41, 44; ii. 21; John iii. 4; Matt. xix. 12), and also *intima hominis* (John vii. 38). It embraces here the organs of sensual desire and of gluttony, not excluding licentiousness, nor referring exclusively to it: so that this passage comprehends more than 1 Cor. xv. 32.—**And whose glory is in their shame** (καὶ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν). Καί takes the place of ὧν. Ἡ δόξα signifies the honor and glory which belong peculiarly to them; that which they conceive to be glory, but which is actually and truly their shame, and will in the end prove to be such. BENGEL well remarks: *Deus et gloria ponuntur ut parallela. Sic venter et pudor sunt affinia. Id colunt isti, cujus ipsos maxime pudere debebat et suo tempore pudebit misere.* But there is no reference to circumcision, the genitals (BENGEL, *et al.*) It is not intimated that they have perverted Christian truth to palliate their moral laxity (WIESINGER). —**Who mind earthly things.** The individualizing article οἱ introduces the comprehensive characteristic: τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες. The nominative is the logical subject (MEYER), and it is not vocative (WINER's *Gram.*, p. 183).

Ver. 20. **For our citizenship is in heaven** (ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει). The confirmatory sentence (γάρ) points back like vers. 18, 19, to ver. 17, and states why the Philippians should look to Paul and to those who walk as he does (ἡμῶν as in ver. 17 ἡμᾶς). [Their souls are mundane and grovelling. They have no fellowship with us; for *we* are citizens of a heavenly commonwealth. The emphatic position of ἡμῶν contrasts the false adherents of St. Paul with the true (LIGHTFOOT). On the state of the text see the notes.—H.] Πολίτευμα, found only here in the N. T., denotes according to its termination and its derivation (from πολιτεύεσθαι i. 27) citizenship, commonwealth, the rank and rights of a citizen. Comp. πολιτείαν ταύτην ἐκτησάμην, Acts xxii. 28. True Christians have nothing to do with an earthly possession and existence simply, but are citizens of the heavenly (ἐν οὐρανοῖς) Jerusalem (Gal. iv. 26; Rom. v. 2; viii. 24; 2 Thes. ii. 8; Heb. xii. 22, 23) even here. We are not to join ὑπάρχει with ἐν οὐρανοῖς, as if the citizenship did not exist here at all, but to regard ἐν οὐρανοῖς as descriptive of the character of the πολίτευμα rather than the place. Hence this sentence does not confirm the conclusion of ver. 19 (WINER's *Gram.* p. 453, MEYER, *et al.*); for it is not pertinent to say 'for this very reason I warn you against them,' since he does not warn but exhorts them. It does not confirm καθὼς ἔχετε τύπον ἡμᾶς (WIESINGER), but συμμιμηταί μου γίνεσθε καὶ σκοπεῖτε τοὺς οὕτως περιπατοῦντες (ver. 17). Nor does it present the higher glory of the true Christian as the cause of his deep sorrow over the misconduct of the enemies of the cross (SCHENKEL), since καὶ κλαίων is too subordinate a remark. Again, πολίτευμα is not ἀναστροφή, *walk*, (LUTHER) nor does it refer to the Messiah's kingdom which has not yet appeared (MEYER), for it exists already even upon earth, and only waits for its completion.—**From whence also we look for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.** Ἐξ οὗ, an adverbial expression, equivalent to *unde* (Vulg., WINER's *Gram.*, p. 141 sq.) refers to ἐν οὐρανοῖς, not to πολίτευμα (BENGEL); but is not equivalent to *ex quo* (ERASMUS), nor even to ἐκ ὧν (MATTHIES). Καί before σωτῆρα indicates that He is looked for (ἀπεκδεχόμεθα, an awaiting, *ad finem usque, perseveranter exspectare*, Rom. viii. 19, 23,

25; 1 Cor. i. 7; Gal. v. 5) not merely as κύριος in their πολίτευμα, in contrast with the θεός of the enemies of the cross, but also as a Saviour, in contrast with their 'destruction' (ἀπώλεια). Comp. Luke xviii. 7, 8; xxi. 28. Καί points neither to a relation corresponding to what has been said of their citizenship (MEYER), nor to 'conduct' (WIESINGER), which does not agree with ἀπεκδεχόμεθα.

Ver. 21. **Who will transform the body of our humiliation** (ὃς μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν) explains how the Lord will manifest Himself as σωτήρ. The reference is to a future transformation which relates to the σχῆμα or fashion of the body (ii. 8; 2 Cor. xi. 13, 14; 1 Cor. iv. 6); and not to its identity. Hence Paul does not speak of the body alone as the object of the change (τὸ σῶμα) but adds the genitive of characterization (WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 187 sq.), namely, τῆς ταπεινώσεως, as in Col. i. 22: σῶμα τῆς σαρκός; Rom. vi. 8; τῆς ἁμαρτίας; vii. 24; τοῦ θανάτου τούτου. CHRYSOSTOM well observes: πολλὰ πάσχει νῦν τὸ σῶμα, δεσμεῖται, μαστίζεται, μυρία πάσχει δεινά. But we must also include here the carnal, the sinful in man's nature; for it is that especially which makes up the ταπείνωσις ἡμῶν. Not merely the body, but we ourselves (note the ἡμῶν) suffer these things, which constitute this humiliation, that cleaves to the body. The object or result of the transformation is now stated.—**That it may be fashioned like unto the body of his glory**, σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. The breviloquence (or adj., instead of a sentence) is like 1 Thess. iii. 13; Matt. xii. 13. See WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 624 sq. Out of this arose the variation noted in the critical remarks. The body is now no longer σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως, but has become σῶμα τῆς δόξης, and as that was ours (ἡμῶν) so this is his (αὐτοῦ). The body comes forth from our present humiliation, and becomes a participant in the glory of Him who has transformed it. This is to be effected by the change which makes it like, conformed to, the body of His glory; hence through a transformation into His image (Rom. viii. 29), which begins even here (2 Cor. iii. 18: μεταμορφούμεθα). [The body is that which exhibits His glory not merely because He has it in His glorified state, but because His glory in that state so pre-eminently appears in the spiritual body with which He is there clothed, and which stands forth as the type of the spiritual body into which every one of His true followers will be transformed.—H.] HÖLEMANN joins ἡμῶν with σῶμα, αὐτοῦ with σώματι. HAMMOND explains σῶμα as the church: LUTHER supposes only the weakness and frailty of the body to be meant, MEYER, the change which first begins at the time of Christ's second advent. All of these views are more or less faulty. He has the power necessary to produce such a transformation.—**According to the working whereby he is able also to subdue all things unto himself.** On κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν, see Eph. i. 19, where τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ is added, while here we have τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα. Since all things are and must be subject to Him, He can *also* (καί) transform the (body μετασχηματίζειν); for the καί connects that verb with ὑποτάξαι. It is an *argumentum a majori* (ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα) *ad minus* (μετασχηματίζειν). Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 25–28; 50–57. It is incorrect for HÖLEMANN to connect δύνασθαι and ὑποτάξαι by καί, as if Paul would say that He is able to do all things and subject all things to Himself. [Τὰ πάντα is stronger with the article: not only this, but *all the things* together which require infinite power (comp. ver. 8).—H.]

CHAP. IV. Ver. 1. **Therefore** (ὥστε) introduces the conclusion, as in ii. 12. The section extends from iii. 1 to iv. 1, not merely from iii. 17 to iii. 21 (MEYER); for στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ points back to χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ. [So extended a reference of ὥστε is uncommon and not necessary here. In view of the glorious destiny which awaits those whose citizenship is above, they should persevere and not frustrate such a hope (vers. 20, 21). Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 58.—H.]—**My brethren dearly beloved and longed for, my joy and crown**, is an expression of his love and recognition of them. Ἀδελφοί μου indicates the relation of fellow-believers with respect to the personal fellowship, which not only renders the Philippians an object of special love (ἀγαπητοί), but also of earnest longing (καὶ ἐπιπόθητοι; comp. i. 8). [The Apostle's separation from them was so painful because his affection for them was so strong —H.] Χαρά marks the personal, στέφανός μου the official relation: they are the joy of his *heart* and the honor of his *office* (SCHENKEL). The first expression refers to the present, the second reaches onward into the future. [The στέφανος among the Greeks was the emblem of victory, and not of regal power or dignity, which was denoted by διάδημα. On this distinction see SMITH'S *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 597 (Amer. ed.) Hence "his converts will be his wreath of victory;" for it will appear that he "did not run in vain," (ii. 26), and he will receive the successful athlete's reward. Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 25 (LIGHTFOOT).—H.]—**So stand fast in the Lord** (οὕτως στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ); *i. e.*, as I and those who walk with me stand (iii. 17) and as I have exhorted you (iii. 1 sq.) Comp. i. 27. BENGEL, incorrectly, *ita, ut statis, state* [which disagrees with ii. 17.—H.].—**Beloved** (ἀγαπητοί) thus repeated shows his ardent affection for them.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The instinct of imitation gives force to the power of example; and the Apostle here does not present merely his own apostolic character, but joins with himself those who walk with him.—Sympathy and community of feeling render specially effective an example which embodies ethical views and principles. Hence precisely in the section where the citizenship of Christians in heaven is brought forward, this appeal is specially appropriate. Manifold as may be the forms of life in individuals, they are yet features of one image; they harmonize with each other, are not discordant; the many reflect one type (τυπός). The power and frequency of evil example (1 Cor. xv. 33) make it the more necessary to regard the Apostle's exhortation.

2. Enmity to the cross of Christ, which takes offence at Christ's form as a sufferer, and His

path of suffering wherein His followers ought to walk, has its ground not exclusively indeed, but to a great extent, in a sensual character, subject to the lust of the world, by which many are governed even in the church. From an occasional, easy, and subtle service of the senses it may come to be uninterrupted and overbearing. Gentleness towards the natural man is cruelty towards the spiritual. Forbearance towards sensual desire ends in the loss of eternal glory, and that which passes current under the forms of conventional propriety, is in truth often a shame and disgrace.

3. The stand-point in the Christian life which fixes the eye on the future, the familiarity with God which maintains a close connection with the church, militant on earth but triumphant in heaven, and does not suffer the child of God to forget his eternal inheritance, affords the surest protection against evil example, and gives to good example its strongest attractive power.

4. [Neander:—The earthly mind Paul would say (vers. 19–21) must be far from us, who are Christians; 'for our conversation,' (more correctly 'citizenship') is in heaven.' His meaning is, that Christians, as to their life, their walk, belong even now to heaven; in the whole direction of their life existing there already.—This he deduces from their relation to Christ, their fellowship with Him to whom they are inseparably united, so that where He is there are they also. While here, they are sustained by the consciousness that Christ now lives in heaven, manifested to believers, though hidden from the world. Thither is their gaze directed, as their longings rise towards a Saviour, who will come again from thence to make them wholly like Himself, to fashion them wholly after His own glorious pattern, to transform them wholly into the heavenly. Hence Paul says: "From whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change the body of our humiliation, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." There is not presented here a resurrection, as a restoration merely of the same earthly body in the same earthly form; but, on the contrary, a glorious transformation, proceeding from the divine, the all-subduing power of Christ; so that believers, free from all the defects of the earthly existence, released from all its barriers, may reflect the full image of the heavenly Christ in their whole glorified personality, in the soul pervaded by the divine life and its now perfectly assimilated glorified organ. —H.]

5. [Chr. Wordsworth:—Christ, at His own transfiguration, gave a pledge and glimpse of the future glorious transformation of the risen body, and thus prepared the apostles to *suffer* with Him on earth, in order that they may be *glorified* forever with Him, in body and soul, in heaven (*N. T. Commentary*, vol. ii. p. 357).—H.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

In lack of faith is found the cause of lack of joy.—There is no true renewal without humbly going to the cross of Christ. The bodies of many who profess to be renewed, are temples of the god of the belly and of his servants to whom Christ's cross is so entirely an offence, that they are even its enemies.—He who does not see the Easter sun rising behind the cross on Golgotha is no true Christian, does not cling fast to the good example of the apostles, and the faithful in the church, and becomes himself an evil example which may frighten away and even destroy others.

Starke:—Not all who point out the way to heaven will themselves be received into it. Many helped to build the ark of Noah who did not enter it.—Thou rejoicest when thou canst lay off an old garment and put on a new one: why art thou troubled because thy body shall experience corruption? By this means it lays aside not only what is worthless but attains to a glorious transformation (ver. 21).

Rieger:—Our house, home, city, and fatherland where we belong, the seeking and hoping for which govern all our thoughts, are not mere fancies to be grasped only by the imagination, but exist in heaven; God has prepared them there; and faith in His word affords us a complete representation of them.

Gerlach:—Every one who is not redeemed by Christ's cross from sin and from the present evil world, serves his flesh and minds earthly things, though his imagination take ever so exalted flights, though he be a philosopher, or a slave to grovelling lusts.—No Christian can find perfect rest until even the last trace of sin is overcome and destroyed: hence his life upon earth is a life of waiting and longing.

Schleiermacher:—If a man still values and seeks sensual good he is then an enemy of the *cross* of Christ. If he has earthly honor in view, and desires to distinguish himself before the world, he is then an enemy of the *shame* of Christ which accompanied His sufferings.—Eternal life is not to be thought of apart from a man's reconciliation with himself and with Christ, who has left peace as His most beautiful legacy to His followers.

Heubner:—They who will not recognize the crucified Redeemer as their only righteousness, who are proud of their legal virtue, are as much enemies of the cross of Christ as those who from a fleshly mind will not follow the crucified Redeemer, nor crucify their flesh together with its lusts and desires.—Pride and the lust of the world can make a man an enemy of the cross of Christ.—The holiest thing may become an offence to a corrupt heart, and excite violent opposition.—Even evil examples must be salutary to the Christian, because they deter him from evil: they present it to him in all its fearfulness and render him anxious for himself.—The man who opposes the cross of Christ, labors for his own ruin.—That which is honorable with God, the worldly man does not understand at all.—The present body disturbs the heavenly life; and hence this body is to be glorified. The future body will promote, facilitate the spiritual life. We are to attain to a complete likeness to Christ, even the body is to become like His; but as the condition of this the soul here must first resemble His soul. The power of Christ extends to the new creation of our bodies and of the world.—Though difficult, the Christian may guard himself against the de-

structive influence of evil examples. 1) He has no lack of good examples around him; 2) He sees the fearfulness of evil examples; 3) He has a heavenly calling.—There is a Christian use of bad examples as well as good.

PASSAVANT:—This is the three-fold divine working of the one Redeemer; He has redeemed His people from the *curse* of sin through His blood; He redeems them more and more by His Holy Spirit from the *power* of sin, and He will finally redeem them from all *misery* and all oppression in this evil, godless world, and bring them to His heavenly kingdom.

[NEANDER:—Each one is required to apply to his own life the measure of spiritual discernment bestowed upon him (ver. 16).—All progressive revelation of the Spirit, all new light of which man is made partaker, presupposes a faithful application of what has previously been given (ver. 15).—If each one were careful to put in practice with strict fidelity his own measure of Christian knowledge, without contending with others about matters wherein they differ from himself, how many schisms might have been avoided in the church, how many differences might for its interest have been overcome and adjusted!—H.]

VI. SECTION FIFTH.

Concluding exhortations designed to secure co-operation between the Philippians and the Apostle.

CHAPTER IV. 2–20.

(1). *Exhortation to unity addressed to individuals.*

CHAP. IV. 2, 3.

2 I beseech Euodias [Euodia][1], and [I] beseech Syntyche, that they be of the same
3 mind in the Lord. (And) [Yea][2] I entreat thee also, true yoke fellow, help those
[these] women,[3] who labored [strove] with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and
with other[4] [others] my fellow laborers, whose names are in the book of life.

[1] Ver. 1. [On this change of the name see notes below. The Geneva version has the feminine form of the name instead of the masculine. STEPHENS' text has Εὐωδίαν, which means 'fragrance;' but the correct reading is Εὐοδίαν, 'good way,' according to all the uncial manuscripts.—H.]

[2] Ver. 2. [The common text has καί, but ναί is undoubtedly the correct reading —H.]

[3] *Ibid.* [Our English version misleads the reader here. In the Greek the first pronoun (αὐταῖς, 'them'), refers to Euodia and Syntiche, and the second (αἵτινες='since they') assign them to the class of co-laborers with Paul whose toil and conflicts (συνήθλησαν) they had shared. The translation therefore might be: 'help them, since they labored,' *etc.*—H.]

[4] *Ibid.* [For this use of 'other' (=others) see the note on ii. 3. Instead of the appositional form it may be rendered: 'the rest of my co-laborers.'—H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 2. **I beseech Euodia, and I beseech Syntyche,** Ἐὐοδίαν παρακαλῶ καὶ Συντύχην παρακαλῶ. From the general exhortation (ver. 1) the Apostle passes to one addressed to individuals. The relation of the persons being known to the readers, it was unnecessary to describe it. The repeated παρακαλῶ, I *exhort* (not so correctly *beseech*) indicates that each of them needed the admonition; they were both in fault. The repetition is not merely *ad vehementiam affectus significandam* (ERASMUS). The names, common also elsewhere, belong to women, as αὐταῖς (ver. 3) demands; but the persons are otherwise unknown. GROTIUS incorrectly regards both as men. HAMMOND regards only the second as a man, and BAUER both as parties. SCHWEGLER regards the first as the Jewish party, the second as the Gentile Christian party; but they did not labor with Paul (συνήθλησάν μοι). The Apostle exhorts:—**That they be of the same mind in the Lord** (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν κυρίῳ). See ii. 2. On this agreement the Apostle lays special stress; it belongs to the στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ. They must in some way have been alienated, but on what occasion, in what cause or manner, is not stated or hinted. Hence it cannot be said that, as the expression is borrowed from ii. 2, the motives for this estrangement must have corresponded to those mentioned in ii. 3 (WIESINGER, DE WETTE). With as little reason can it be said that they are deaconesses. [Those who hold that such an order existed in the primitive church generally think that these women belonged to it, and that their variance was the more unworthy on that account.—H.]

Ver. 3. **Yea I entreat thee also, true yoke fellow.** Ναί, very common as *particula affirmantis*, but as *particula obsecrantis*, only elsewhere in Rev. xxii. 20. It indicates the seriousness of the affair to the Apostle that he turns with his entreaties (ἐρωτῶ), to still another (καί σε) be-

sides the women. It is not clear who it is that he invokes in *γνήσιε σύζυγε*. The substantive, in the N. T. found only here, is plain from its opposite, *ἑτεροζυγεῖν* (2 Cor. vi. 14), as also from the use of *ζυγός* (figuratively: Matt. xi. 29, 30; Acts xv. 10; Gal. v. 1; literally, 1 Tim. vi. 1; Rev. vi. 5); hence partner, associate, and the relation of this person to Paul is described as very close, as that of one who draws at the same yoke with himself. It is a stricter connection than that of *συνεργός*. The epithet *γνήσιε* describes the nature and character of this person (ii. 20) as genuine, pure, true. Hence it cannot appear strange that Paul did not address him by name: every one is supposed to know him. It is incorrect to regard *σύζυγε* as a name (CHRYSOSTOM, MEYER, distinctly; WIESINGER with hesitation), as a designation of Epaphroditus (GROTIUS), or of Timothy (ESTIUS), for these could not have been addressed as in Philippi; or arbitrarily of Silas (BENGEL), of the husband of one of two women (the Greek interpreters), or of Paul's wife (CLEMENS ALEX., ERASMUS, *et al.*) contrary to the history (1 Cor. vii. 8) and against the grammar (masculine form). [The noun may be masculine or feminine, but the adj. has properly three terminations, and must be masculine here. Other conjectures, on the supposition that an anonymous person is meant are, that it may have been Luke who appears to have been absent from Rome when the Epistle was written (see on i. 1) or Epaphroditus (LIGHTFOOT) at the side of Paul as he wrote, and whom he addressed (*παρακαλῶ*) at the moment.—H.] LAURENT's view (*Neutest. Studien*, pp. 134–137) is worthy of notice. In reply to the assertion that the name Syzygus does not occur, he remarks that names are not objects of literature, but products of social or civil life, as for example, Onesimus, Tryphena, and Tryphosa (Rom. xvi. 12). He explains the passage thus: "Thou, who, a genuine Syzygus, hast already by thy birth (*γνήσιε*) and thy name been called to be a yoke fellow and helper of all laborers in the vineyard of the Lord, lay hold now also of the work together with these two sisters, that they through thy aid may carry it forward with one spirit, not as heretofore, in discord! For Paul does not mean to blame them (as in ii. 20) but to praise them, and hence would not imply that he has only one *γνήσιον σύζυγον* in Philippi." Like *Εὐοδία* (way of faith), Syntyche and Syzygus appear to him to have been names received after baptism, as in the case of others, whose names are more familiar to us. [The best view after all seems to be that of MEYER, LAURENT, and others, that Syzygus or Synzygus (*σύνζυγος*) is a proper name, borne by one who had been associated with Paul in Christian labors, who was at Philippi when the Apostle wrote the letter, and was well known there as deserving the encomium which this appeal to him implies. Paul nowhere uses this word (*σύζυγος*) of any one of his official associates, being used in fact nowhere else in the N. T.: it is found here in the midst of other proper names (vers. 2, 3); and the attributive *γνήσιε* corresponds finely and significantly to the appellative sense of such a name. That such an alliteration is not foreign to Paul's manner, see Philem., vers. 10, 11. The name, it is true, does not appear anywhere else; but many other names also are found only in single instances, and certainly many names to us must have been in use among the ancients which have not been transmitted at all. Paul himself repeatedly mentions persons in his epistles who are named only once, and a catalogue of names might be made out from the Acts of the Apostles, of those whose whole history for us lies in a single passage. See MEYER's *Brief an die Philipper* on iv. 3.—H.]—**Help these women** (*συλλαμβάνου αὐταῖς*) presents the object of the request. The verb (Luke v. 1) signifies 'to take hold vigorously with,' 'to assist one,' *i. e.*, here to re-establish harmony. It is not *ut habeant, unde se suosque sustentent* (GROTIUS), against the context.—**Who strove with me in the gospel**, states the motive for helping these women in the work of reconciliation. Hence he adds *αἵτινες*=*ut quæ* (see Eph. i. 23). Ἐν *εὐαγγελίῳ* marks the sphere, as in 1 Thes. iii. 2, in which they had labored with him (*συνήθλησάν μοι*). The verb points back to the beginning of Christianity at Philippi, when the women embraced it (Acts xvi. 13), and had exerted themselves to advance it. They had contended at Paul's side for the gospel, and ought not now to strive against one another, against Christianity and against Paul; they are so useful and deserving in other respects, they should be right also in their relation to each other.—**With Clement also, and with my other fellow-laborers** (*μετὰ καὶ Κλήμεντος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν συνεργῶν μου*), brings to view the fact that various persons at Philippi at that time were harmoniously engaged in behalf of the gospel, men, as Clement and others, as well as (*καί-καί*) women associated with them. Paul thus exalts the merits of Syntyche and Euodia who labored in such company. Clement was a Philippian; which is evident, but nothing further, not even that he was a teacher (MEYER). We have no right to suppose him to have been Clemens Romanus (Catholics), or Flavius Clemens, Domitian's *patruelis* (BAUR). He does not of course mention the *λοιποὶ συνεργοί* by name, because it is superfluous, as in the case of the *γνήσιος σύζυγος*. [The closer proximity and the nature of the thought connect *μετὰ συνεργῶν μου* with *συνήθλησαν*, rather than with *συλλαμβάνου αὐταῖς*. The position and influence of the women as co-partners in Christian service with Paul and his associates rendered the spectacle and effects of such strife the more deplorable, and thus enforced the appeal (*συλλαμβάνου*) to strive the more earnestly to promote harmony between them.—H.]. In his joy on their account he adds:—**Whose names are in the book of life**, *ὧν ὀνόματα ἐν βίβλῳ ζωῆς*. [We are to refer *ὧν ζωῆς* to *τῶν λοιπῶν* apart from CLEMENT, because the Apostle having named the latter would recognize the others though unnamed by him, as yet having their names written in heaven (MEYER, ELLICOTT and others). This expression does not of itself decide whether these other fellow-laborers were living or dead, but certainly it is altogether improbable that Clement was the only one of them who still remained. —H.] The figurative expression was suggested perhaps by iii. 20, for the registers of the citizens of Israel, out of which one's name was

erased on his decease prepared the way for the expression סֵפֶר חַיִּים (Exodus xxxii. 32; Isa. iv. 3; Ezek. xiii. 9; Ps. lxix. 29; Dan. xii. 1) which was adopted in the N. T. (Luke x. 20; Acts iii. 5; xiii. 8; xvii. 8; xx. 15) in order to mark the certainty of the eternal inheritance, the blessedness which is to be reached by faithful striving. [It is clear from the expression "blotting out of the book," (Rev. iii. 5) that the image suggested no idea of absolute predestination. For the use of the phrase in Rabbinical writers see Wetstein here (LIGHTFOOT).—H.] 'Εστί is to be supplied, not the optative (BENGEL). It is the joyful certainty, not a wish that Paul has in mind here.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The servant of the word of God ought not only to exhort the whole church from the pulpit, but also with a special care for souls to warn individuals.

2. The pastor in his oversight of souls should not stand alone, but be aided by others properly qualified. The lay-element should be cultivated for the service of the church.

3. Goodness at the beginning does not protect one from a fall afterward, nor courageous striving for the gospel from ill-natured arrogance towards others, nor the vanquishing of outward foes from weak indulgence towards one's self.

4. The unity of the church as a body must extend into the narrowest circle of neighborhood and home.

5. He who will exhort, incite others, must generously recognize what is praiseworthy, and attach himself to the good which already exists.

6. Women are to be highly esteemed in the church for their services; but they should act with men (μετά), and not work independently.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—There are peace-disturbers enough, but not so many peace-makers. To the work then! and help check those who love contention, and thus make peace!—Even women are to help in extending the kingdom of God with their prayers, gifts, good counsel, *etc.*, and to contend fearlessly for the gospel.

RIEGER:—A tried, approved mediator can often by the grace of God adjust many difficulties.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—Let us strive with all our powers to *extend* Christian fellowship, and yet not weaken it.

HEUBNER:—To have a genuine colleague is not a privilege granted to every one (ver. 3).

---

(2) *General exhortation to Christian joy.*

(CHAPTER IV. 4–7).

4, 5 Rejoice in the Lord always: (and)[1] again I [will] say, rejoice. Let your modera-
6 tion [gentleness] be known to all men: The Lord is at hand. Be careful for no-
thing; but in everything, by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your
7 request [requests] be known unto [before] God. And the peace of God, which pas-
seth [every] understanding, shall keep [guard] your hearts and [your] minds through
[in] Christ Jesus.

[1] Ver. 4 [This 'and in the A. V. answers to καί in the common text, which is, however, unwarranted. For the asyndeton which thus occurs, see WINER's *Gram.*, p. 537. See the notes below on ἐρῶ.—H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 4. **Rejoice in the Lord always** (*χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ πάντοτε*) takes up in connection with ver. 3 (*ὧν ὀνόματα ἐν βίβλῳ ζωῆς*) the theme of the epistle. See iii. 1. A tone of special emphasis rests on "always" (*πάντοτε*): there lies the difficulty and the glory of rejoicing in the Lord. —**Again I will say, rejoice** (*πάλιν ἐρῶ, χαίρετε*) repeats the command with emphasis.—BENGEL incorrectly joins *πάντοτε* with *πάλιν*.—[The verb (*ἐρῶ*) is future. not present, as in the A. V. This reiterated exhortation is the more remarkable when we recollect that Paul as he wrote or dictated the letter had his right arm chained to the arm of a Roman soldier, or at all events was a prisoner under the eye of a sentinel who never left him (see Acts xxviii. 20).—H.]

Ver. 5. **Let your forbearance be known to all men**, though without any external notation, connects itself logically with *χαίρετε*, since joy has of itself a tendency to make us mild and gentle: *gaudium in domino parit veram æquitatem erga proximum*, (BENGEL). *Τὸ ἐπιεικὲς ὑμῶν* is stronger than the substantive, *ἐπιείκεια* (2 Cor. x. 1; Acts xxiv. 4), and implies that this quality (*τὸ ἐπιεικές*) pervades the entire nature of the *ὑμῶν*. Comp. iii. 8; Rom. ii. 4; Heb. vi. 17. It signifies mildness, forbearance, (used with *ἄμαχος*, 1 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. iii. 2; between *εἰρηνική* and *εὐπειθής*, Jas. iii. 17; with *ἀγαθός*, 1 Pet. ii. 18), hence not 'becoming conduct' (MATTHIES). It is to be known to

all (*γνωσθήτω πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις*) without exception, to strangers, and so much the more to neighbors, because they have such occasion to see it manifested towards themselves and towards others. The context leads us to think more directly of the adjustment of difficulties, the removal of dissension (vers. 2, 3) for effecting which the gentleness which spares the delinquent is a great assistance. [The *ἐπιεικὲς ὑμῶν* stands in contrast to the *ἀκριβοδίκαιος*, as being satisfied with less than is one's due. ARIST. *Eth. Nic.*, v. 10 (LIGHTFOOT).—H.]—**The Lord is at hand** (*ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς*) in whom they are to rejoice, hence Christ, under whose eye they are to walk and act, who will also judge them: *judex vobis propitius, vindex in malos* (BENGEL). This is a strong motive to the exercise of forbearance. We are not to refer *κύριος* to God (CALVIN), since *πρὸς τὸν θεόν* follows in ver. 6, and the subject here is not that of the providence of God, but the *παρουσία* or advent of Christ. MEYER incorrectly joins it with what follows. [This nearness of Christ admits of other explanations. It may mean that He is ever near to His people as their efficient supporter and helper, so that with such an arm to defend them they have nothing to fear from the power or malice of their enemies (comp. Matt. xiii. 11; 1 Pet. iv. 7); or, more probably, that He is always near to them in point of time, will soon come to relieve them of their cares and trials, and receive them to their appointed rewards and rest in heaven (John xiv. 3; Rom. xiii. 11, sq.) See note on i. 7. There is no necessary, certainly no exclusive, reference here to a definite expectation of the near advent of Christ, and the end of the world.*—H.]

Ver. 6. **Be careful for nothing,** (*μηδὲν μεριμνᾶτε*) enjoins freedom from anxiety since *gaudium in domino legitimam securitatem in suis rebus parit* (BENGEL). *Μηδέν*, accusative of the object, excludes every subject of harassing care, whether fruitless labor or the events which precede the Lord's advent (ver. 5); hence not anxious solicitude merely is forbidden (GROTIUS).—**But in every thing** (*ἀλλ' ἐν παντί*) is the antithesis to *μηδέν* (comp. Eph. v. 24).—**By prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be known unto God,** (*τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσει μετὰ εὐχαριστίας τὰ αἰτήματα ὑμῶν γνωριζέσθω πρὸς τὸν θεόν*) is the antithesis of *μεριμνᾶτε*. He who rejoices in the Lord has not to do with 'earthly things' (*τὰ ἐπίγεια*, iii. 19). *Τὰ αἰτήματα ὑμῶν*, are the contents or objects of the prayers, *desideria vestra* (Luke xxiii. 24; 1 John v. 15). The verb *γνωριζέσθω* has a threefold limitation: 1) the way (*τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσει*) which the article points out as the appointed one, and its repetition as consisting of two parts or acts (on the difference see Eph. vi. 18); 2) the accompaniment: *μετὰ εὐχαριστίας* (comp. Eph. v. 4; Col. ii. 7; iv. 2), which should never be wanting in prayer and request; and 3) the direction (*πρὸς τὸν θεόν*) to whom the prayer should be directed. We are not to run to men with our complaints and lamentations. BENGEL well points out the connection of vers. 4–6: *tristitiam et curam comitatur morositas.*

Ver. 7. **And the peace of God, which passeth every understanding.** *Καί* adds now a promise. Joy in the Lord is accompanied by the *peace of God, etc.* The genitive marks the author (see Eph. i. 2; Col. iii. 15; and comp. WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 186), and the participial clause the value of the peace which as the context shows must be understood as an inward state or peace of soul, in contrast with violence (ver. 5), anxiety (ver. 6) and in connection with joy (ver. 4). Hence 'the peace' (*εἰρήνη*) is not harmony with one another (MEYER), which does not accord with the following predicates, nor reconciliation with God (ERASMUS), which peace of soul presupposes, and on which it is founded. This peace of God is a possession defined as *ἡ ὑπερέχουσα πάντα νοῦν, i. e.*, towering above (ii. 3; iii. 8; Eph. iii. 19) the reach of man's understanding, however strong it may be (*πάντα νοῦν*), (Eph. iv. 17). The comparison is between peace as the object of emotion and experience, and the understanding as the perceptive or rational faculty, and not between the incomprehensibility of this peace and the understanding (ERASMUS, *res felicior, quam ut humana mens queat percipere*, and so MEYER *et al.*) [According to MEYER'S view (1859) the comparison lies in the efficacy of God's peace, on the one hand, and of man's reason or understanding on the other, to lift the soul above disquietude and the power of the world. So essentially LIGHTFOOT: '*Surpassing every device* or *counsel*' of man, *i. e.*, which is far better, which produces a higher satisfaction, than all punctilious self-assertion, all anxious forethought. ELLICOTT translates: '*which overpasseth every understanding*,' *i. e.*, 'which transcends every effort and attempt on the part of the understanding to grasp and realize it.' The similarity between the language here and Eph. iii. 20 speaks almost decisively for the latter and more obvious interpretation: 'Who is able to do exceedingly abundantly above all that we ask or think,' *αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν*.—H.] We are not to think at all here of the doubting or perplexed understanding (DE WETTE).—**Shall keep your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus,** characterizes the efficacy of the peace in question. The verb (*φρουρήσει*) signifies *to guard*, while the tense marks the continuance of this protection; it is a promise, assurance, not a wish (VULG., *custodiat, et al.*) The object *τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν*, is the inner personality, made emphatic and exhaustive by the repeated article and pronoun. BENGEL: *cor sedes cogitationum.* Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15. Thus the whole and its parts, the principal and derivative, in the individual's life, are preserved *adversus omnes insultus et curas* (BENGEL); or *ὥστε μένειν καὶ μὴ ἐκπεσεῖν αὐτοῦ, τῆς πίστεως* (CHRYSOSTOM). Comp. 1 Pet. i. 5. [The *νοήματα* reside in and issue from the *καρδία* (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15): for in the Apostle's language *καρδία* is the seat of thought as well as of feeling (LIGHTFOOT)—H.] This result is ac-

* [NEANDER suggests still another, or at least a modified interpretation. The consciousness that "the Lord is nigh," furnishes a motive for the exercise of forbearance under provocation. His persecuted people walk in the sight of the Lord and dare not give way to passion in the near presence of Him, who endured every wrong with heavenly patience and long-suffering. This consciousness that the Lord is near will also restrain them from wishing to anticipate His justice, to take the work of retribution into their own hands.—H.]

complished ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, and hence apart from Him it does not spring from any inherent efficacy in the peace itself. Without His aid it is not possible to abide with Him, to obtain or to keep His gifts.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Joy in the Lord is the theme of this epistle, and the chief feature in the portrait of the Christian. On this frame of mind much depends: gentleness towards all men, in word and deed, since it causes many a provocation to pass unnoticed, or to be borne patiently; freedom from care and delight in prayer, for the Christian knows and frequents the way to God, and casts all his care upon Him who cares for him, being driven by care to prayer, and by prayer driving away care; inward peace, which God has wrought, and continues to strengthen in the soul.

2. Our consciousness of the nearness of the Lord, is strengthened by our very joy in the Lord, which is only perfected in the other world, so that we feel His coming to be a blessing, and desire it (ver. 5).

3. The prayer for what is lacking should never be separated from thanksgiving for what has been granted (ver. 6).

4. All that moves, disquiets thee, may and should become a subject of prayer, but the sort of prayer, manifold as may be the reason for it, is definite, and not every prayer avails.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—Two things trouble us: sin and affliction: on the other hand we find here a double incitement to rejoice in the Lord; Rejoice!—A Christian must be no towering tulip, but rather a humble violet, dispensing everywhere a sweet perfume.—Thou lion and tyrant in thy house! When an honorable man, a stranger approaches thee, thou ceasest perhaps to scold, and curse, and rage: why hast thou not as much reverence for the Lord who is near thee?—To care is God's part, but to labor and in prayer to commit the issue to Him, is ours—To-day peace, to-morrow war! So it was formerly in the world, so it is now and so it will be to the end; but the peace of God is an eternal peace.

RIEGER:—Everything in the Lord's life, character, and experience is indeed a cause of joy to you. His condescension in His incarnation and birth, His walk in the world, His sufferings, cross, and death, His life and glory, His present concealment in God, His revelation from heaven ever near and nearer to us.—One may have the inward ground of joy in the Lord, though he has not the same susceptibility at one time as at another.—Yet joy in the Lord does not lead one to violent outbursts, or on the other hand to sit indolently, but to work, and it is this exercise which keeps it pure. A joyful follower of our Lord Jesus Christ, has to deal with different men, who in many ways have need of his forbearance.—Sometimes, indeed, even our reason performs good service against care, and promotes contentment of mind. But too often our reason is itself the fountain of many cares, or at least meets with cases where it is entirely helpless.—Out of the heart the life flows; if it is not protected it evaporates, and the senses bring in many a thing from the world, which has power to disturb our contentment.

GERLACH:—Let the Lord who in grace and judgment is ever near His people, care for all things. Address no prayer to Him, even out of the deepest distress, without thanksgiving; for even in the greatest misery you have more reason for thanksgiving and joy than for sorrow and complaint. Thus you can maintain joy in the Lord and gentleness towards men, at the same time.

[ROBERT HALL:—Seek repose by prayer. If your mind be overcharged or overwhelmed with trouble and anxiety, go into the presence of God. Spread your case before Him. Though He knows the desires of your hearts, yet He has declared He "will be sought after;" He will be "inquired of to do it for you." Go, therefore, into the presence of that God who will at once tranquillize your spirit, give you what you wish, or make you more happy without it and who will be your everlasting consolation, if you trust in Him. He will breathe peace into your soul, and command tranquillity in the midst of the greatest storms. How much are they to be pitied who never pray. The world is to them all gloom and disappointment; for *there* they see none of the kindness and protection of our heavenly Father. We do not wonder that the sorrow of the world worketh death, with the distresses, afflictions, and disappointments to which human nature is exposed (ver. 6).—H.]

SCHLEIERMACHER:—What then are the chief things in the holy joy of Christmas? 1) Joy in the entire Lord and Redeemer. 2) A common feeling of love and joy (*a*) in the consciousness of the kindness and favor of God, our heavenly Father, which have been manifested in Christ Jesus; (*b*) in the purity and serenity of Christian joy. 3) Joy not over this or that aspect of heart and life, but over universal inward development.

PASSAVANT:—This gentleness manifests itself at one time as equanimity and patience under all circumstances, among all men, and in manifold experiences; at another as integrity in business relations; as justice, forbearance, and goodness, in exercising power; as impartiality and mercy in judging; as noble yielding, joyful giving, and patient enduring and forgiving.—As the epistle for the fourth Sunday in Advent.

HEUBNER:—The true joy of the Christian in Advent. 1. Its nature. It springs from the past, the present, and the future coming of the Lord. 2. Its effects: gentleness, freedom from care, disposition to pray, peace. It is the best preparation for Christmas.

LÖHE:—The approach of the festival as typical of the second coming of Christ greets us with a four-fold trumpet-blast: 1) Joy in Christ; 2) gentleness and goodness; 3) prayer and thanksgiving; 4) a prolonged sweet tone of peace, which is higher than all reason.

AHLFELD:—Supplication and thanksgiving are better than care. 1. Care gnaws the marrow and pith out of God's gifts. 2. Rise above it and leave it to your Lord. 3. Live in prayer and thanksgiving. He will gladly help you.

Law and Testimony. It is necessary to call solemnly to mind the much forgotten second coming of the Lord. 1) It brings holy joy in every way; 2) it is a rampart and wall against all hate and harm; 3) it inspires care-conquering prayer; 4) it enfolds us in God's peace.

PRÖHLE:—The Christian disposition of mind in the holy time of Advent. 1) Holy joy; 2) tender love of men; 3) firm trust in God; 4) divine peace.—Difference between the holy mind of Christians and the wanton mind of the world. 1) The sources: the former springs from believing, sanctified hearts; the latter from a fortunate gift of nature, or it is the fruit of the sinful flesh. 2) Expressions: the former in religious joys, in lawful earthly pleasures used with moderation, a gentle, loving spirit, with God before the eye and in the heart; the latter, in sensual joys and violent passions. 3) Duration: the former always, the latter now and then. 4) Effects: the former liberates from care and melancholy, and renders one inclined to and qualified for the good; the latter leads away from God into sin.—The Lord is near! The thought (1) sanctifies our joys; (2) dissipates our cares; (3) consecrates our prayers; (4) fills us with love and forbearance towards our neighbor.

[J. S. HOWSON:—The Apostle Paul illustrated his precepts by example. He was remarkable for his habit of combining thanksgiving with his prayers (see ver. 6).—I know of no more instructive study than to go over all the ground from Romans to Philemon, taking the structure of the Epistles as we find it, and noticing these streams of prayer and praise, sometimes as they appear separately, very frequently together. We have grand doxologies after the commencement of some great truth, or at the prospect of some glorious future, as in the letter to the Romans, (xi. 33); "O the depth of the riches; both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God!" or in the First to the Corinthians (ix. 57): "Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ!" The habit strikes us more forcibly when the reference is to something *personal*. Thus, at the mention of the long-delayed, but at last accomplished meeting with Titus (2 Cor. ii. 14): "Now thanks be to God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ!" Even in his statement of a fact, Paul uses a eucharistic form (Rom. vii. 25): "Who shall deliver me? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." "Thanks be to God which put this into the heart of Titus." 2 Cor. viii. 16. "I thank God that I baptized none save Crispus and Gaius." 1 Cor. i. 14. "I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than you all." 1 Cor. xiv. 18. Even when he speaks of food, the name which he employs is: "That for which I give thanks." And what is said of thanksgiving may similarly be said of prayer. Thus, with the same kind of exuberant impulse, after a doctrinal statement: "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that He would grant you to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man." Eph. iii. 14–16. So when he has been describing his projected journey: "Now the God of peace be with you." Rom. xv. 33. So when he has been giving advice to an individual: "Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things." 2 Tim. ii. 7. Evidently with St. Paul the law of Prayer is the law of Praise. Supplication and gratitude are almost always inter-linked together; or at least when one is present, the other is seldom far absent. "I will pray with the Spirit, and I will sing with the Spirit: I will pray with the understanding, and I will sing with the understanding." 1 Cor. xiv. 15. In the Christian life he clearly assumes that Thanksgiving will follow easily in the footsteps of Prayer, and that Prayer will be mindful to fill the place which has just been occupied by Thanksgiving. Two parallel sentences from the Ephesians may conclude this imperfect list of illustrations: "Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." Eph. v. 20. "Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance." Eph. vi. 18. Different as St Paul's Epistles are in most respects from the Psalms of David, they resemble them in this combination. The lesson derived from both, and in both cases alike enforced by the writer's example, is this: "Offer unto God thanksgiving; and call upon Him in the time of trouble; so will He hear thee, and thou shalt praise Him," (Ps. l. 14, 15). See *Lectures on the Character of St. Paul*, p. 150 (London, 1864).—H.]

---

(3). *General exhortation to Christian progress.*

(CHAPTER IV. 8, 9)

8 Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest [honorable] whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if
9 there be any praise, think on these things. Those [The] things which ye have both [also] learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me [these] do: and the God of peace shall be with you.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 8. **Finally,** *τὸ λοιπόν*, introduces the conclusion, but does not strictly resume iii. 1 again (MATTHIES). [This expression indicates an approach to the end. and as MEYER remarks, its recurrence here shows Paul's reluctance to say the last word of farewell.—H.] It is here added how and wherein the peace of God (ver. 7) is to manifest itself; and as ver. 7 states what God does, so this declares what remains for men to do. (DE WETTE). The address, **brethren,** *ἀδελφοί*, is prompted by the fervor of his feelings; and to this fervor is due also the six times repeated *ὅσα*. [The words which follow here may be said to be arranged in a descending scale. The first four describe the character of the actions themselves, the two former, *ἀληθῆ, σεμνά*, being absolute, the two latter *δίκαια, ἁγνά*, relative; the fifth and sixth *προσφιλῆ, εὔφημα*, point to the moral approbation which they conciliate; while the seventh and eighth *ἀρετή, ἔπαινος*, in which the form of expression is changed (*εἴτις* for *ὅσα*), are thrown in as an after-thought that no motive may be omitted (LIGHTFOOT).—H.]—**Whatsoever things are true,** *ὅσα ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ*. The *ὅσα* indicates that all things, without exception, which the category embraces are meant; while *ἐστίν* implies their actual existence in contrast with the arbitrary supposition of men. *'Αληθῆ* is the morally true, in harmony with the objective rule of morality in the gospels. See Eph. iv. 21. It should neither be limited by *in sermone* (BENGEL) nor be taken as merely subjective in the sense of sincerity (ERASMUS).—**Whatsoever things are honorable** (*ὅσα σεμνά*), designates things of a worthy character corresponding to the essence of the *ἀλήθεια* (1 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. ii. 2). [They are such as men esteem, regard with respect, veneration.—H.]—**Whatsoever things are just** (*ὅσα δίκαια*) signifies the things which accord with the law, as in Eph. iv. 24, and should not be limited by *erga alios* (BENGEL). — **Whatsoever things are pure** (*ὅσα ἁγνά*) describes the same qualities or acts intrinsically (2 Cor. vi. 6; vii. 11; Jas. iii. 17; 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 John iii. 3; *ἁγνῶς* i. 17). It is not simply 'chaste' (GROTIUS).—**Whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report** (*ὅσα προσφιλῆ, ὅσα εὔφημα*) comprises again a two-fold relation; both words have reference to the estimation of men, the first however designating what is valuable and dear to the heart of man, (*προσφιλῆ*), the second (*εὔφημα*) what is praised, esteemed among men, in word and deed. The first should not be supplemented by *τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ τῷ θεῷ* (CHRYSOSTOM), or restricted by *τῷ θεῷ* (THEODORET), or interpreted as *benigna, quæ gratiosum faciunt hominem* (GROTIUS). The second does not refer to *quæ bonam famam conciliant* (ERASMUS), or to *sermones, qui aliis bene precantur* (STORR), which is opposed to the context.—**If there be any virtue, and if there be any praise,** sums up the preceding; *εἴ τις ἀρετή* refers to the first two pairs, *καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος* to the last pair. The former, *ἀρετή*, used of God, 1 Pet. ii. 9; 2 Pet. i. 3, here and in 2 Pet. i. 5, of men, signifies moral rectitude in disposition and action; the latter (*ἔπαινος*) the moral judgment of men, hence not *res laudabilis* (CALVIN, *et al.*); virtue (*ἀρετή*) calls forth praise (*ἔπαινον*): this presupposes that.—Thus what is in a Christian sense moral, is described in manifold relations, and the Apostle now says of it:—**Think on these things,** *ταῦτα λογίζεσθε*, not the same as *φρονεῖτε*. The Philippians should choose these things as the subject of their meditation, have them ever in their thoughts.

Ver. 9. The train of thought leads us here to the province of action.—**The things which ye have also learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me.** The first *καί* points to the *ἐστίν* with *ὅσα*. [Hence it does not signify *both* (A. V.), but *also*, *i. e.*, it adds the Apostle's example and teaching to the claims of the virtues themselves. LIGHTFOOT makes the first *καί* responsive to the third, and so connects the verbs in pairs.—H.] *'Εμάθετε καὶ παρελάβετε*, refer to instruction, the former indicating the act in this process, as that of the Philippians, the latter, as that of Paul. The second intimates that the first could not have taken place without the second. *'Ηκούσατε καὶ εἴδετε* refer to examples of which the Philippians had knowledge by report or from personal observation, and which *καί* joins with the instruction (*ἐμάθετε*). *'Εν ἐμοί* belongs to both verbs, for Paul is an example in word as well as act. Therefore *καί-καί-καί* is not "as well as," nor *ἐμάθετε genus*, and the others *species* (HÖLEMANN), nor does *ἠκούσατε* refer to preaching (CALVIN, *et al.*).—**These do** (*ταῦτα πράσσετε*) is parallel to *ταῦτα λογίζεσθε;* both together, thinking and doing, are what Paul enjoins.—**And the God of peace shall be with you,** *καὶ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν*. The particle connects the result (='and so,') with the injunction. The promise points to ver. 7. He has the peace of God as his protection, who has the God of peace with him and in him.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Salvation with all its inward wealth and manifold relations, is a unit. It harmonizes with the standard (*ἀληθῆ*) immanent in it, whereon depends its dignity, its worth (*σεμνά*), agrees with the rule made objective in the law (*δίκαια*), so that it is unspotted (*ἁγνά*), has its echo in the creature (*προσφιλῆ*), and in the circles formed by it (*εὔφημα*).

2. Salvation is obtained through a saving union of doctrine and example.

3. He who rightfully claims salvation in word, has resting upon him still more the duty of bearing witness to it in his life.

[ANDREW FULLER:—"The God of peace shall be with you" (ver. 9). We cannot experience the peace of God, and joy in the Holy Ghost, unless we have the testimony of our own consciences that in simplicity and godly sincerity we have had our conversation in the world.—What is this peace? The Christian, the minister who enjoys a well-grounded persuasion that he possesses the favor of Jesus Christ, whose confidence is in Him who sits at the helm of the universe, who walks with God and has the testimony of a good conscience, possesses the peace of God.—H.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—Christians have no need of the teachings of pagan morality, for no virtue can be found, or anything else praiseworthy and glorious, which is not found in God's word.—Whoever will have the blessings of salvation, must submit to the divine plan of salvation.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—In regard to what is honorable, just, pure, lovely, and of good report, there is a true and a false standard, and for this reason the Apostle here places the true at the beginning, that when the following exhortations are presented this fact, which our experience so often discloses, may at once occur to the Christian, and he may be led to examine himself and see whether he also is everywhere seeking for the true.

HEUBNER:—The Christian should not be one, but many-sided; he should strive after all that is excellent.—The true type of Christian virtue rejects all falsehood.—KLOPSTOCK inserts ver. 8 in his ode to the Redeemer at the close of the Messiah.

[ROBERT HALL:—There are very different virtues. If we would be complete in our Christian profession, we must attend to *all* the virtues of it;—whatsoever things are true, honest, just, or lovely, as well as those sublimer things which more immediately respect God and Christ, and heaven and eternity. The beauty of the Christian character is not formed so much by the gigantic size of one virtue, as from the harmony and consistency of all. Never, then, let it appear which virtue has been most approved by you, but cultivate *every* virtue (ver. 8).—H.]

---

(4). The Apostle's thankfulness for the gifts of love which he has received from them.

(CHAPTER IV. 10–20).

His joy on account of such friendship (ver. 10); *correction of a possible misunderstanding on their part* (vers. 11–13); *grateful recognition of their kindness* (vers. 14–17); *and assurance of the divine blessing* (vers. 18–20).

10 But I rejoiced in the Lord greatly, that now at the last your care of me hath
flourished again; wherein ye were also careful, but ye lacked [were lacking]
11 opportunity. Not that I speak in respect of want, for I have learned, in whatsoever
12 state I am (therewith) to be content. I know both [also][1] how to be abased, and
I know how to abound; every where [in everything], and in all things I am in-
13 structed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need. I
14 can do all things through Christ[2] [in him] who strengtheneth me. Notwithstanding
15 ye have well done that ye did communicate with [shared in] my affliction. Now,
ye Philippians, [also] know (also) that in the beginning of the gospel, when I de-
parted from Macedonia, no church communicated with me as concerning [for an ac-
16 count of] giving and receiving, but ye only. For even in Thessalonica ye sent once
17 and again unto[3] my necessity. Not because [that] I desire a [the] gift: but I de-
18 sire [the] fruit that (may) abounds to your account. But I have all, and abound:
I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you,
19 an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God. But my
God shall supply all your need according to his riches[4] in glory by [in] Christ Je-
20 sus. Now unto God and our Father be glory forever and ever. Amen.

[1] Ver. 12. [We are to read καί after the first οἶδα, and not δέ as in the common text. The witnesses are decisive. So TISCHENDORF, MEYER, ELLICOTT, WORDSWORTH, and others decide.—H.]

[2] Ver. 13. Only a few manuscripts add Χριστῷ. ℵ (inserted afterwards) A B C *et al.*, omit it. It is an exegetical variation. [The change makes the expression like 1 Tim. i. 12, and that conformity may have been the motive for the change.—H.]

[3] Ver. 16. [Some good authorities omit εἰς after δίς, but it is undoubtedly genuine, having been overlooked in some copies in consequence of the successive similar endings.—H.]

[4] Ver. 19. [The older rendering is τὸ πλοῦτος instead of τὸν πλοῦτον. The manuscripts (LACHMANN, TISCHENDORF) fluctuate in some other places between the neuter and the masculine.—H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 10. But I rejoiced in the Lord greatly. Paul commences by adding (δέ) something else which concerns himself personally (ἐχάρην). He limits this statement in two ways; first, by designating the element (ἐν κυρίῳ) and secondly, the degree (μεγάλως) of his joy, the latter word being at the end for the sake of emphasis.—**That now at the last your care of me hath flourished again.** Ὅτι introduces the reason of his joy: ἤδη ποτὲ ἀνεθάλετε. This form of the verb is not found elsewhere. See WINER'S *Gram.*

p. 87. The verb (from θάλλω to bloom, be luxuriant, or to cause to bloom) signifies to become green again, or to make green again. [The figure was not suggested by the season of the year when the gift was sent (BENGEL), but the thought in its freshness budded into poetry (EADIE).—H.] The Philippians are regarded in the figure as a tree or field, wherein the concealed life has shown itself anew in the bestowal of the gifts of love, which are, as it were, the new buds or shoots of spring. The figure does not admit of the transitive signification (GROTIUS, with an appeal to Ezek. xvii. 24), and the context, which presents the reason for his great joy, forbids our referring it to a return of prosperity (MEYER, SCHENKEL: to thrive, prosper in their circumstances); and also forbids (for it contains no reproach) our regarding either the emphatic ἤδη ποτέ as *tandem aliquando* (MEYER), though it may be so taken in Rom. i. 10 where it stands with the future, or ἀνεθάλετε as pre-supposing the readers to be deficient in sympathy, as it were withered, unproductive, ἀπομαρανθέντες ἐν τῇ ἐλεημοσύνῃ (ŒCUM. *et al.*) Under what circumstances the Apostle's welfare (τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ) could not be a subject of the concern and care (φρονεῖν) of the church, is not stated, nor can it be conjectured. BENGEL, who however goes too far when he says *videtur legatio a Philippensibus tempore verno constituta, a quo metaphora sumitur*, observes very justly: *τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ dicitur ut τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν*, ver. 18, and also *regitur a φρονεῖν.* Hence τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν is not to be taken as the accusative of relation (WINER's *Gram.*, p. 317 sq.) In a word, a new life has sprung up in the church, which has led them to consider (φρονεῖν) how they can do something again for the Apostle (τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ). If it could be suspected that any censure was intended here, what follows serves at once to remove that suspicion, for it excludes entirely all ground for such a thought. —**Wherein ye were also careful, but ye were lacking opportunity**. Ἐφ' ᾧ, which is always neuter with Paul, and indicates the basis of the φρονεῖτε (WINER's *Gram.*, p. 392 sq.), has τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ for its antecedent, while ἐφρονεῖτε, which the prefixed καί associates with their failure to contribute to his support, declares, that notwithstanding such omission, they had been thoughtful in the matter, so that they could not have been ἀπομαρανθέντες ἐν ἐλεημοσύνῃ. It was not the disposition, but the outward circumstances that were at fault (ἠκαιρεῖσθε δέ). The omission of μέν after ἐφρονεῖτε, to which δέ corresponds, states the palliating antithesis with greater point and vivacity. DE WETTE incorrectly explains φρονεῖν ἐπί as a thinking without doing, φρονεῖν ὑπέρ a thinking with doing. The action is not indicated by the preposition, but is expressed in ἀνεθάλετε. We are not to refer ᾧ to ἐμοῦ for its antecedent, (CALVIN), nor to translate ἐφ' ᾧ *although* (LUTHER), or *sicut* (VULG.), or *post id* (GROTIUS). In what the unfavorableness of their condition consisted, is not stated or intimated. But Paul's joy on account of the change does not permit us to find it in the state of their resources, their temporal means, (MEYER, *et al.*), or in the want of an opportunity to transmit their gifts (ERASMUS). [The more precise translation of ἠκαιρεῖσθε may be *ye were not having a favorable time*: which as already remarked leaves it uncertain in what respect it was unfavorable. Of the conjectures that of MEYER and others (see above) is as probable as any other. The want of something to send to the Apostle is less likely to have been the difficulty than the want of a suitable messenger. The commission as a fiduciary trust required honor and fidelity on the part of the agent, and was not to be entrusted to every one who might offer himself for the service. The journey too was a difficult one, involving perils by land and sea, and (as shown in all probability by the narrow escape of Epaphroditus himself) requiring courage and physical hardihood, which many would not possess though not deficient in other respects.—H.]

Ver. 11. **Not that I speak in respect of want**, (οὐχ ὅτι καθ' ὑστέρησιν λέγω) denies that the relief of any personal want was the cause of his joy, which is not of a nature to depend on external circumstances. On οὐχ ὅτι see iii. 12. WINER's *Gram.*, p. 597. On καθ' ὑστέρησιν, see WINER's *Gram.*, p. 402.—He now adds in confirmation:—**For I have learned in whatever state I am to be content** (ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔμαθον ἐν οἷς εἰμι αὐτάρκης εἶναι). Comp. 2 Cor. ix. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 6; Heb. xiii. 5. Ἐγώ is emphatic: with others it may be different. There is no reason for supplying *in tot adversis*, or *divinitus* with ἔμαθον (BENGEL). Ἐν οἷς εἰμι means his condition at any time; and does not refer merely to his condition at that time, nor is ἐν οἷς to be taken as masculine (LUTHER, *with whom*). [Prof. EADIE reminds us that the great divine, Dr. Isaac Barrow, has four sermons on this text. See under HOMILETICAL and PRACTICAL.—H.]

Ver. 12. **I know also how to be abased** *or* **brought low**, (οἶδα καὶ ταπεινοῦσθαι) begins the account of his resignation, contentment (αὐτάρκεια). The order of the contrasts (ταπεινοῦσθαι, περισσεύειν) appears to adjust itself to the condition of the Apostle at the time when he wrote the Epistle. The knowing (οἶδα) is a consequence of the learning (ἔμαθον). On the facts see 2 Cor. iv. 8; vi. 9, 10. Καί adds to the general statement ἐν οἷς εἰμι, the more particular one.—**And I know how to abound**—οἶδα καὶ περισσεύειν. Here καί adds the opposite as having also been learned. Περισσεύειν harmonizes better with the context than would the more exact opposite of the preceding verb (ὑψοῦσθαι). PELAGIUS: *ut nec abundantia extollar, nec frangor inopia.* GROTIUS: *in rebus exiguis patienter me gerere, rebus abundantibus cum modo uti.* The signification *excellere* (ERASMUS) is untenable.—**In every thing and in all things I have been instructed** *or* **initiated.** —Ἐν παντὶ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι is to be explained by ἐν οἷς (ver. 11). Both then are neuter, embracing all states and every state. The first is not equivalent to *ubique* (Vulg.), nor is the second masculine (LUTHER: among all; BENGEL: *respectu omnium hominum*). The perfect of the verb (μεμύημαι) denotes the continuance of the state described. There is manifestly here a climax: ἔμαθον as pupil, οἶδα as companion, μεμύημαι as master. Only a gradation, however, is indicated in the extent and exactness of the knowledge, but there is no reference to a divine revelation (ESTIUS, BENGEL). The verb is followed by the

accusative or dative; hence ἐν παντὶ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι only describes the condition, in which this knowledge manifests itself; what he has been taught is stated in the following infinitives, equivalent to accusatives after the verb.—**Both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need** (*καὶ χορτάζεσθαι καὶ πεινᾶν, καὶ περισσεύειν καὶ ὑστερεῖσθαι*).

Ver. 13. **I can do all things in him who strengtheneth me.**—Summing it all up, he says, *πάντα ἰσχύω*. [Πάντα is the 'quantitative' accusative after ἰσχύω (Gal. v. 6; James v. 16) defining the measure and extent of the action (ELLICOTT).—H.] Again, climacteric from knowledge to ability (Gal. v. 6; James v. 16), and *πάντα* is entirely general, extending even beyond the categories just mentioned. VAN HENGEL incorrectly restricts it to *omnia memorata*. It sounds like boasting, hence in humility he adds: *ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντί με*. In himself there resides no such knowledge and ability; it has been bestowed upon him, he has it only in and from the Lord who alone creates it. Comp. Eph. vi. 10; 2 Cor. xii. 9; Acts ix. 22; Rom. iv. 20; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 1; iv. 17.

Ver. 14. **Notwithstanding** (*better*, **nevertheless**) **ye have well done.**—Πλήν turns the attention from Paul to the Philippians and their gifts, which are now estimated positively. *Cavet, ne fortiter loquendo contempsisse ipsum beneficium videatur* (CALVIN). [Notwithstanding (*πλήν*) he did not need their bounty to relieve his wants, he is thankful for it, and commends their generosity.—H.]—*Καλῶς ποιήσατε* describes their contribution as a good deed, which the following more closely defines: **That ye shared in my affliction**—*συγκοινωνήσαντές μου τῇ θλίψει*. It was therefore a fellowship (a *κοινωνεῖν*) with the affliction (*θλῖψις*), which last denotes his hard condition, not merely want; hence it was compassion, interest, but as the emphatic position of *μου* indicates, for the sake of the person, in devoted love. *Composito verbo innuitur, etiam alios alio modo fuisse κοινωνήσαντες* (BENGEL). Comp. ver. 16; 2 Cor. ix. 11. [This sympathy on the part of the Philippians with the suffering representative of Christ and His cause is the very trait of character which the Judge selects for eulogy at the last day. See Matth. xxv. 35 sq. (EADIE).—H.]

Ver. 15. **Now, ye Philippians also know**—*οἴδατε δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς, Φιλιππήσιοι*. The transition to the past is indicated by *δέ*; *καί* points to Paul, for they and he alike know what has been done by them. The insertion of the name of the church shows his deep emotion, and gives a marked emphasis, as 2 Cor. vi. 11. No contrast with other churches is implied (BENGEL).—**That in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia.**—Ὅτι introduces the object of their knowledge. Ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, a limitation of time which ὅτι ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας, the first departure from Macedonia (Acts xvi. 11—xvii. 15), so defines, that it must be understood from the standpoint of the Philippians, since for them the existence of the gospel began when the Apostle preached in Macedonia. [The "beginning of the gospel" at Philippi implies that he visited the Philippians on some other and later occasion. This intimation tallies exactly with Acts xx. 2, 6, which states that Paul came to Philippi (since *μέρη ἐκεῖνα* in the former passage would include that city), both on his second journey from Macedonia to Greece, and on his return from Corinth to Asia Minor and Jerusalem.—H.] It is incorrect to regard *ἐξῆλθον* as used for the pluperfect (VAN HENGEL, WIESINGER, *et al.*), which is forbidden by *ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, and besides ver. 16 does not refer merely to the gifts sent to Corinth.—**No church communicated with me for an account of giving and receiving, but ye only**, *οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινώνησεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως, εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς μόνον*. Only the words *λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως* are difficult. The context, especially ver. 17, explains *εἰς λόγον* as meaning *for account of;* for the genitives, like the words *debit* and *credit*, receipts and expenses, point to the keeping of accounts as the source of the phraseology (CICERO, *Læl.* 16: *ratio datorum et acceptorum*). Hence BENGEL incorrectly takes the meaning to be *quod attinet* (*limitat*), as if in other ways than with gifts of love, other churches had indeed communicated with him. Further, it is the present giving and receiving of Paul and the Philippians that are spoken of: he gives the gospel and receives their gifts, they bestow their gifts and take gifts from him, God's word. Hence it is not a giving of the Philippians and receiving of Paul in the matter of the gifts of love (GROTIUS, *et al.*), or a giving of Paul and receiving of the Philippians, in *rebus spiritualibus* (the Greeks, *et al.*), nor are we to think of gifts of money from Paul to the Philippians (RHEINWALD), or, least of all, that with Paul the page headed *δόσις*, with the Philippians that headed *λῆψις* remained blanks (MEYER), for the two run into each other, and we are not to think merely of the temporal.

Ver. 16. **For even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my necessity.**—Ὅτι is *quia* (Vulg.), or *nam* (LUTHER), and confirms *εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς μόνοι*. It does not depend on *οἴδατε*, it is not 'that' (VAN HENGEL, *et al*). Ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ states that it was in Thessalonica that the gifts came to him, so that the designation of place can indeed be joined with *ἐπέμψατε*, but rather belongs with *μοι* (WINER's *Gram.* p. 414), and the prefixed *καί*, with an allusion to *ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, denotes the early period of this contribution, while *καὶ ἅπαξ καὶ δίς* (1 Thess. ii. 18) renders the repetition of their giving prominent with a hint at the rapid succession of the gifts. [The *both once* and *twice* is emphatic, *i. e.*, not *once* only, but *twice* (DE WETTE, ELLICOTT). The *καί*, *also*, connects other and later instances of their liberality with the gifts which he received so early and promptly at Thessalonica immediately after his departure from Macedonia. We read in 2 Cor. xi. 9 that while Paul was at Corinth, after having preached in Macedonia, where Philippi was situated, he received supplies from that province. The particular place from which he received them is not named in that passage, but as the Apostle declares here that no other church aided him in that way, we must conclude that the bounty which he acknowledges in the Epistle to the Corinthians is that which he tacitly accredits here to the Philippians.—H.]—Εἰς τὴν χρείαν designates the need of the Apostle, the article indi-

cating that it was a present need, and also known to the Philippians.

Ver. 17. **Not that I desire the gift** (*οὐχ ὅτι ἐπιζητῶ τὸ δόμα*) denotes that he was not concerned about the definite material present. The verb is simply *quæro*, the preposition denoting the direction, as in *ἐπιποθῶ* (i. 8). The present tense denotes 'the constant, characteristic tendency: that is not his case' (MEYER). Hence it is not *studiose quæro* (HÖLEMANN).—**But I desire the fruit,** *ἀλλὰ ἐπιζητῶ τὸν καρπόν*. —Emphatic repetition of the verb in the antithetical clause. ['I do *not* want the gift, I *do* want the fruit,' *etc.* (LIGHTFOOT).—H.] 'The fruit' suggests the idea of the gift, the present, as seed sown which will be followed by a harvest (Gal. vi. 18), and points to a manifold reward (MEYER). But there is no reference to the Christian life as first bringing forth the gift (RILLIET).—**That abounds to your account,** *τὸ πλεονάζοντα εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν*, describes the fruit as one that grows for the advantage of the Philippians: that what they have entered as *δόσις* is registered to them as *λῆψις*; they may therefore receive from Paul, from other churches, from the Lord Jesus Christ and God Himself, what will prove a blessing to them for time and for eternity. On *πλεονάζειν* see Rom. v. 20; vi. 1; 2 Cor. iv. 15; 2 Thess. i. 3. To this *εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν* belongs, which is not equivalent to *εἰς ὑμᾶς*, *ratione vestri* (BENGEL), and not to *ἐπιζητῶ* (VAN HENGEL), nor is *καρπός* here equivalent to *τόκος*, interest (MICHAELIS), for the context gives no occasion to adopt this meaning, though *λόγος* is to be held as implying 'account.'

Ver. 18. **But I have all, and abound. I am full.**—*Ἀπέχω δὲ πάντα* is an expression of his complete content: he has all that (Matth. vi. 2; v. 16; Phil. 15) he needs or desires, so that he has nothing left to wish for. It is not "receipt" (ERASMUS), also not *habeo autem omnia* (Vulg.). With a climactic force *καὶ περισσεύω* is added: I have yet more than I need and wish, am even filled (*πεπλήρωμαι*), have abundance around and within. Not outward abundance is meant, but complete inward satisfaction.—**Having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you** (*δεξάμενος παρὰ Ἐπαφροδίτου τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν*) points to the mode in which he had come into this state.—He describes their gift as: **An odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God.**—*Ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας* (comp. Eph. v. 2), *θυσίαν δεκτήν, εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ*, represents the gift under the image of an offering. The dative belongs equally to both expressions. Comp. ii. 17; Rom. xii. 1; Heb. xiii. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 5. Every gift and act of love should be regarded as an offering made to God in thankfulness, and hence it is that they are acceptable, well pleasing to Him.

Ver. 19. **But my God shall supply all your need** (*ὁ δὲ θεός μου πληρώσει πᾶσαν χρείαν ὑμῶν*) attaches itself to *τῷ θεῷ*. God allows no offering to be made to Him in vain, especially when it is a gift to one whose God He is. Comp. i. 3. Paul's God will repay the Philippians for having so contributed to his aid that he could say *πεπλήρωμαι*. Hence *πληρώσει* measures, as it were, the recompense to them by his *πεπλήρωμαι*, and *πᾶσαν χρείαν ὑμῶν* responds to *εἰς τὴν χρείαν μοι* (ver. 16). The reference is not merely to bodily want (CHRYSOSTOM), or even to spiritual (PELAGIUS), but to bodily and spiritual combined, and the recompense also should not be restricted to the other world (MEYER).—The *πληρώσει* is now qualified.—**According to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus.**—The limitation is three-fold: (1) *κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος αὐτοῦ* shows the relation of the recompense to the gift of the church; (2) *ἐν δόξῃ* states the kind of recompense: in a glorious way; (3) *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* presents the medium by which it is effected. It is incorrect to join *ἐν δόξῃ* with *πλοῦτος* (GROTIUS, *et al.*), since *αὐτοῦ* stands between, and with *πλοῦτος* we should have had the genitive *δόξης* (Eph. i. 14; iii. 16; Col. i. 27; Rom. ix. 23). [The adverbial sense of *ἐν δόξῃ* has hardly any parallel elsewhere. The *constructio prægnans* affords a better meaning (LIGHTFOOT): in the state of glory where they would ultimately be, and partake of Christ's glory at the right hand of the Father; and it is in Him (*ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*) as the sphere of their existence that they attain this exaltation and blessedness.—H.]

Ver. 20. **Now unto God and our Father be glory for ever and ever. Amen.**—The doxology here forms a natural conclusion: *τῷ δὲ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ ὑμῶν* recalls *ὁ θεός μου* (ver. 19), who is also the God of the Philippians, and not merely God, but also our Father. See on i. 2. With *ἡ δόξα* supply *εἴη*. See Eph. iii. 20, 21; Rom. xi. 36. The glory which He has shall also be acknowledged even *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*, an expression equivalent in sense to *εἰς πάντας αἰῶνας*, Gal. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11; v. 11.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Christian life, both of individuals and of churches, can no more be without its waverings, its ebb and flow in the stream of its activity, than nature can fail of its winter, spring, summer and autumn (ver. 10). This should be no cause of stumbling.

2. The manifestations of Christian activity are a cause of joy less on account of the material benefits they confer, than on account of the power of love and of life which they evince: and this is the reason why they are not to be lightly esteemed.

3. Both traits of character are important: dignity in circumstances of misfortune and trial, without weakness and without ill-humor; and nobility of soul in the midst of abundance, without pride or arrogance. The last of these, perhaps, is more difficult to acquire than the first.

4. Man can of himself do nothing in matters of morality, but in Christ, who strengthens him, he can do all things (John xv. 5).

5. There is a certain *solidarity* of earthly and heavenly interests, bodily and spiritual, like that which exists between the body and the soul. Romanism, in its proneness to a false ascetism, underrates the former. Socialism and Communism, which attach themselves only to this life, deny the latter. The lower or temporal interests should be subordinated to the higher or

spiritual; they should be servants, not masters, under the control ever of a mind which maintains its ascendency over the earthly and present. These higher interests cannot be replaced by the lower; they should not be displaced by them.

6. The gift of love is in form and product the true gift, and should be regarded as a sacrifice brought to God and well-pleasing to Him (ver. 18).

7. [AUGUSTINE:—I have learned from Thee, O Lord, to distinguish between *the gift* and *the fruit*. The *gift* is the thing itself, which is given by one who supplies what is needed, as money or raiment. But the *fruit* is the good and well-ordered will of the giver. It is a *gift*, to receive a prophet, and to give a cup of cold water; but it is *fruit*, to do those acts in the *name* of a prophet, and in the *name* of a disciple. The raven brought a *gift* to Elias when it brought him bread and flesh; but the *widow fruit*, because she fed him as a man of God (ver. 17).—H.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—What virtuous pagans have learned from nature, as in a shadow, that they should not allow themselves to be lifted up by fortune and abundance, nor let their courage sink in misfortune and want, is a knowledge which true Christians have by reason of their faith, in all truth, fulness, and purity.—Thou desirest to know nothing of Christ's power in overcoming sin, and ever excusest thy deeds as effects of human weakness: but if thou art a true Christian, and thus in Christ, thou art strong enough to conquer all things. If thou hast not this strength, then is Christ also not in thee.—God is a rich Proprietor, to whom thou lendest what thou dost give to the poor, and who will recompense thee a hundred-fold, if not in this world, yet certainly in eternal glory (ver. 19).

RIEGER:—From that which one endures, something also should be learned. Nature is content with little, grace with even less. Most desires are first aroused by comparison with others.—So soon as I turn away from Christ, any thing can overthrow me. So soon as I am in Christ, I can withstand all things.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—The Apostle's boast: 1) what he boasts of himself; 2) how he gives Christ the glory.

HEUBNER:—In many a one the spiritual impulse seems at times dead, as the life in flowers and trees, but in favorable weather it breaks out again in buds, blossoms and fruits. Even the manifestation of that which is good is controlled by circumstances (ver. 10).

[ISAAC BARROW:—He who has the consciousness of fulfilling the condition, will secure the effect of that promise: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."—This is what supported the Apostles and kept them cheerful under all the heavy load of distresses which lay on them: "Our rejoicing is this: the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity—we have had our conversation in this world."—It is an evil conscience that giveth an edge to all other evils, and enableth them sorely to afflict us, which otherwise would but slightly touch us.—The contemplation of our future state is a medicine to work contentedness and to cure discontent. Considering heaven and its happiness, how low and mean, how unworthy of our care and affection, will these inferior things appear.—What is any loss, any disgrace, any cross in this world to me, who am a citizen of heaven, who bear a capacity and hope of the immense riches, the incorruptible glory, the perfect and endless joys of eternity? "For this cause," says Paul, "we faint not—while we look not on the things which are seen, but on the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal." And he says again: "I reckon that the sufferings of the present life are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us."—H.]

VII. CONCLUSION:

Salutation and Benediction (iv. 21–23).

CHAP. IV. 21–23.

21 Salute every saint in Christ Jesus. The brethren who are with me greet [salute]
22 you. All the saints salute you, chiefly [but especially] they that are of Cæsar's
23 household. The grace of our [the[1]] Lord Jesus Christ be with you all [your spirit[2]].
Amen.[3]

[1] Ver. 23.—[The A. V. reads ἡμῶν after κυρίου, but on no sufficient authority.—H.]

[2] *Ibid.*—Instead of μετα τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν some manuscripts read μετὰ πνευμάτων υμῶν. [LACHMANN and TISCHENDORF adopt the former in their text. MEYER regards μετὰ τοῦ πνευμάτος ὑμῶν as borrowed from Gal. vi. 18. The English Version translates the common μετα παντῶν ἡμῶν, which is not well supported.—H.]

[3] *Ibid.*—'Αμήν is found in ℵ A D E K L. The subscription in ℵ is πρὸς φιλιππησίους, and in B the same with ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ρώμης added, while K subjoins δι' 'Επαφροδίτου.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 21. **Salute every saint in Christ Jesus,** *ἀσπάσασθε πάντα ἅγιον ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.* He desires to single out every member of the church as embraced in this greeting; and hence he uses the singular (*πάντα*), and does not write *πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους*. The nearer limitation, *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, belongs to the verb (Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12: *ἐν ἁγίῳ φιλήματι*). It is to be a Christian salutation; *ἅγιος* does not need any limitation (VAN HENGEL, *et al.*), as Eph. i. 1 shows. — **The brethren who are with me salute you,** adds salutations (*ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς*) entrusted to him by others, *οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοί, qui mihi vincto ministrant, qui me visitant, qui mecum hic in evangelio laborant* (ESTIUS); hence the smaller circle (i. 14), which, however, we are not to divide into travelling companions (as Luke, Titus and others) and those who lived in the place (as Clemens, Euodia, *et al.*) (VAN HENGEL).

Ver. 22. **All the saints salute you** (*ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι*), all Christians in Rome who did not happen to stand in personal or official relations with himself.—**But especially,** *μάλιστα δέ*, marks a greeting delivered to him with great earnestness.—**They that are of Cæsar's household,** *οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας.* Since *οἰκία* most naturally means house, then palace, the imperial servants are probably meant. Neither the context nor the history gives us reason to understand the word in the sense of family, as in 1 Cor. xvi. 15, and to suppose the members of the imperial family, the relatives of the Emperor, to be referred to (BAUR, VAN HENGEL). Still less appropriate is it to suppose the Prætorians to be meant (MATTHIES), as in i. 13. The expressions 'palace' and 'prætorium' do not admit of being interchanged. It is not correct to think of Cæsarea and the *βασίλειον τοῦ Ἡρώδου* on account of *Καίσαρος* (BÖTTGER, *et al.*). Who they were and why they sent an especial salutation is not stated. [NEANDER conjectures that possibly they may have been natives of Philippi, or have known some of the Philippian Christians who had been at Rome. Perhaps we are not to seek so far for an explanation. The Apostle's 'especially' (*μάλιστα*), which so emphasizes the greeting of 'those of Cæsar's household,' may represent the tone of hearty earnestness with which they spoke up, as he was writing or dictating the letter, and asked them to send their kiss of love (*ἀσπασμός*) to these Philippians of whom they had heard so much from the Apostle. For this the parties need not have had any personal knowledge of each other. As servants in the palace (especially if Paul was quartered in that neighborhood) they may have been brought into relations of special intimacy with Paul.*—H.]

Ver. 23. **The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen.**—*Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν. Ἀμήν.*—Entirely like Gal. vi. 18; Rom. xvi. 24; 1 Thess. v. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 18; 2 Cor. xiii. 13. [This remark must be understood of a similarity in the import and not the form of the salutations.—H.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Salutations are tokens of personal interest and living fellowship which should not be lightly esteemed.

2. It is important that the grace of the Lord be in us, not merely that we be surrounded by it.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—The Apostolic salutations teach that the Christian religion does not make men unfriendly and stubborn, but courteous and friendly.—A Christian salutation is a benediction, and not merely a custom: the fashionable world uses instead its empty compliments.—O Rome! Rome! how greatly hast thou changed! Formerly thou hadst true saints even in the household of a pagan and tyrannical emperor; but now hast thou false saints, especially in and around the so-called chair of Peter and at the court of his supposed successor.

GERLACH:—Thus among the slaves of the emperor Nero there existed a believing and loving community of Christians who felt a special interest in foreign churches. Perhaps it is on account of this noteworthy circumstance that Paul brings them forward so prominently.†

HEUBNER:—Christianity had forced its way into the very presence of the emperor, had found entrance among the servants of the court. Whether Seneca was among them or not is unknown. Christianity finds its way every where, and the worst places are not closed to grace.

NITZSCH:—The salutations of the saints which the Apostle delivered in such numbers and so earnestly rest—1) on faith and a confession of the one true church of the Lord; 2) they are an expression of the feeling of our communion, of our higher, heavenly relationship in the family of God; 3) they furnish significant proofs of Christian love.

---

* [Some have supposed that Seneca may have been one of the members of the Emperor's household, to whom Paul here refers. On this question of the possibility of an acquaintance between the Apostle and the philosopher during Paul's captivity at Rome, Professor LIGHTFOOT has an extended *Dissertation* in his *Commentary on Philippians*, pp. 268–331. The discussion involves an elaborate examination of the spirit and teachings of Stoicism as compared with those of the Gospel. The essay is indeed one of great value.—H.]

† [It was their own request, and not Paul's act, which made them prominent (see on ver. 22).—H.]

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS.

BY

KARL BRAUNE, D.D.

GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT AT ALTENBURG, SAXONY.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, WITH ADDITIONS,

BY

M. B. RIDDLE, D.D.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,
743 AND 745 BROADWAY.

THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

1. SYNOPSIS.*

I. ADDRESS AND SALUTATION (I. 1, 2).

II. PART FIRST: MENTION OF THE GROUND OF CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP AND WARNING AGAINST APOSTASY (I. 3.—II. 23).

1. *Thanks to God for the faith and love of his readers from the beginning* (i. 3—8). Paul prayerfully gives thanks for the faith of the Colossians in Christ and their love to the brethren, which rests upon Christian hope (vers. 3—5a), and in joy at the preaching of the gospel, which they had forthwith embraced (vers. 5b—6), as brought to them by Epaphras, who had told the Apostle of it (vers. 7, 8).

2. *Earnest supplication for the progress of the church in true knowledge, especially of the Being and Work of Christ* (i. 9—23). The immediate object of the supplication is fuller knowledge of the Divine Will (ver. 9), in order to upright Christian walk in gratitude (vers. 10–12) for the Redemption in Christ (vers. 13, 14), whose Person is then set forth as to His inmost Being (ver. 15), His efficiency in creation (ver. 16) and Providence (ver. 17) and as Head of the Church (ver. 18), in order to mark how heaven and earth were embraced in the Redemptive Work of Him (vers. 19–20), in whom they also have now a part (vers. 21–23).

3. *Joy of the Apostle in his sufferings and labors* (i. 14–29). Paul rejoices that the sufferings of Christ are becoming ever more complete through his own (ver. 24), and sketches his ministerial relation in furtherance of Christ's cause (vers. 15–20).

4. *Anxiety of the Apostle lest they be led away through false wisdom* (ii. 1–15). After a free expression of his concern about the spiritual health of the church (vers. 1–3), he briefly sketches the situation (vers. 4, 5), then exhorts to faithfulness in walk (vers. 6, 7), warns against apostasy (ver. 8) and praises the glory of Christ and His Work (vers. 9–15).

5. *Two special warnings* (ii. 16–23): against carnal legal service (vers. 16–17), against superstitious angel-worship (vers. 18, 19), with a comprehensive conclusion (vers. 20–23).

---

* [The following is a popular summary:
I. The doctrinal part: I.—II. 3 (corresponding with Eph. I.—III).
II. The warning: II. 4.—23 (with no parallel in Eph.).
III. The practical part: III. IV. (corresponding with Eph. IV.—VI).—R.]

III. **PART SECOND**: EXHORTATION TO TRUE VITAL SANCTIFICATION (III. 1.—IV. 6).

1. *The foundation and prospect of a genuine Christian sentiment and walk* (iii. 1–4). Fellowship with the exalted Redeemer points to "things above" (vers. 1–3) and has an elevating prospect (ver 4).

2. *General Exhortations* (iii. 5–17): a) *negatively*, to put off the carnal nature (iii. 5–11), first and fundamentally, as respects the lusts and possessions of earth (vers. 5–7), then in social relations with one another (vers. 8–11); b) *positively*, to practice Christian affection toward each other, and to glorify Christ in word and work (iii. 12–17). The social virtues of the new man are set forth (vers. 12–14), their tone given (ver. 15) and helps described (vers. 16, 17).

3. *Special Exhortations* (iii. 18–iv. 1);

a) to wives (ver. 18) and husbands (ver. 19);

b) to children (ver. 20) and fathers (ver. 21);

c) to servants (vers. 22–25) and masters (iv. 1).

4. *Concluding Exhortations* (iv. 2–6) in relation to prayer (vers. 2–4), conduct (ver. 5), speech (ver. 6).

IV. **CONCLUSION.** (IV. 7–18.)

1. *Personal intelligence* (vers. 7–9).

2. *Salutations* and *Messages* (vers. 16, 17).

3. CLOSING WORDS (ver. 18). [AUTOGRAPH SALUTATION, EXHORTATION AND BENEDICTION.—R.]

2. The FUNDAMENTAL THOUGHT, as BÄHR justly remarks, is: "Christ the Head of all things." Upon this Paul places himself in open antagonism to error (ii. 6–23), as well as to deduce clearly and definitely thence the lines, both of his doctrine—quietly arranged without expressed antithesis (i. 9–23)—and of his directions respecting Christian walk (iii. 1.—iv. 1). The Epistle to the Ephesians on the other hand sets Him forth as "the Head of the Body." In both Christ is the centre, with this modification only, that in this Epistle the *Christliness* [*Christlichkeit*] is more prominent than the *churchliness* [*Kirchlichkeit*], the *life* of the church more than its *nature*.

§ 2. CHARACTER AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EPISTLE.

1. What is said of the Epistle to the Ephesians (Introd. § 2, 1) is applicable here with this difference: there the overflowing fulness of the thought struggles with the expression, here in parallel passages we find a briefer, acuter, indeed a more *clear* and *mature* encasing of the thought.* The independence of the author is quite unmistakable. We find evidence of it in the pithy brevity which controls both thought and language, while it is not less apparent in the ἅπαξ λεγομένοις,† which are either altogether without analogy (ii. 8: συλαγωγεῖν; ii. 18: καταβραβεύειν), or remind us of parallel passages only that we may recognize his gift of language as ii. 4: πιθανολογία (2 Cor. ii. 4); i. 23: μετακινεῖν (2 Cor. xv. 58); iii. 1: σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ (Phil. ii. 1); compare also the order in iii. 11: Ἕλλην καὶ Ἰουδαῖος, which is altogether exceptional.

2. References more or less definite to the situation of the Apostle (i. 24–29; ii. 1; iv. 3, 10, 18), and to his relation to the Colossian Church (i. 4, 9; ii. 1), to its origin (i. 7, 8), its full membership (iii. 18; iv. 1) and simple organization (iv. 17), its external relation to neighboring Churches (iv. 13), to friendly and sympathizing persons (iv. 9–14), as well as to its internal condition as respected Christian life (i. 4–6, 8, 9; ii. 6, 7) and threatened danger from false teachers (ii. 8–23), afford a firm basis for a clear sketch of the situation. (See § 4.)

3. In contrast with the *Universalism* of the Epistle to the Ephesians, there prevails in our

*

Col.	Eph.	Col.	Eph.	Col.	Eph.
i. 4.	i. 15.	i. 15.	i. 7.	iii. 12, 13.	iv. 2, 3, 32.
i. 5.	i. 13.	i. 16.	i. 21.	iii. 16.	v. 19, 20.
i. 9.	i. 8, 17.	ii. 19.	iv. 15, 16.	iii. 18—iv. 1.	v. 22—vi. 9.
i. 10.	iv. 1.	iii. 5, 6.	v. 5, 6.	iv. 2–6.	vi. 18–20.
i. 11.	iv. 9, 10; i. 19.	iii. 8.	iv. 31.		v. 15; iv. 29.
i. 13.	ii. 2; vi. 12; i. 6.	iii. 9, 10.	iv. 22, 25.		

† [ALFORD, New Testament, Vol. III. *Proleg.*, p. 40, gives a list of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, thirty-five in number, and then remarks the fact that *nineteen* or *twenty* occur in the second chapter—introduced there by the nature of the subject. At the same time he attributes many to Paul's style, to the σεμνότης of controversial tone.—R.]

Epistle a *Monism:* the Person of Christ, and again and again the Person of Christ, and this exclusively. Hence instead of "the Word of God" (i. 25; Rom. ix. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 36; 2 Cor. ii. 17; iv. 2), or "of the Lord" (1 Thess. i. 18), "of truth" (i. 5), "of wisdom," "of knowledge" (1 Cor. xii. 8), "of the Cross" (1 Cor. i 18), ' of reconciliation" (2 Cor. v. 19), we find here alone (iii. 16) "the Word of Christ." The Epistle is thoroughly Christological; Christ's Person is the Lord of Eternity, ruling heaven and earth, the visible and invisible (i. 14–16, 19; ii. 9), who by entering into our race and the history of humanity (i. 18), has reconciled all things and all classes to God (i. 20, 21), has so spanned all centuries of development, that out of Him and before Him even the highest mental culture and noblest morality are but rudiments, elements of the world which pass away (ii. 8); in Him are given Peace (i. 20), Life (i. 18; ii. 13; iii. 1–3), Salvation and Bliss (i. 22; iii. 4), likewise all virtue (iii. 5–14) in all the moral relations of life (iii. 18; iv. 1), and this is done by the ethical method of faith (i. 23; ii. 13), in obedience to His word (iii. 16), in vital fellowship with Him (ii. 11–15; iii. 1–4), and in prayer (iv. 2), so that Christ *for* us becomes Christ *in* us (ii. 13–15; iii. 3, 4).

4. The *judgments* respecting this Epistle confirm the preceding statements, as well as mark its significance. This is in part the same as that of the Epistle to the Ephesians (Introd., § 3), so far as they coincide, but consists peculiarly in this, that Christianity is here set forth as the full bloom of true wisdom and the norm on which all false wisdom is put to shame, and at the foundation is placed the connection of the most profound truth with the simplest Christian walk.—CALVIN calls it on account of the first chapter: an incomparable storehouse; COCCEIUS: *brevis epistola, sed nucleum evangelii continens et opposita omnibus postea subingressis completis.*—BÄHR: "vivacity and strength, depth and fulness of thought, often struggling with the words, great natural talents, which however are pervaded, illuminated and exalted by the Spirit of God. But a pithy, compact brevity appears as especially characteristic in this Epistle. It breathes the spirit of tenderest love and joy in all sorrows and afflictions. Although bowed down by external circumstances, which made it impossible for him to go into all the world, bearing the name of Jesus unto all the Gentiles, the inward joyousness and elevation of the great Apostle to the Gentiles increased but the more."—BÖHMER (*Isagog.*, p. 160) passes this judgment on our Epistle: *viva, pressa, solida, nervis plena, mascula.*—STEIGER finds this Epistle *fresher*, the connection with the news just received not effaced, and sees in the Epistle to the Ephesians only echoes from this.—Even DE WETTE uses the "rich brevity" of the Colossian Epistle to condemn that to the Ephesians as a "verbose expansion" of it.—SCHENKEL remarks that the structure of words and sentences throughout is original.—The opposing, dissenting judgments are partly in regard to details, partly based upon pre-conceived views (see § 3) rather than upon the Epistle itself, and hence cannot be deemed of any weight.—[ALFORD, comparing it with that to the Ephesians, calls it: "his caution, his argument, his protest; so to speak, his working-day toil, his direct pastoral labor." Hence we have here "system defined, language elaborated, antithesis and logical power." WORDSWORTH, in making the same comparison, says: "The Apostle is both a builder and a soldier. He builds up the truth in one Epistle, and he wars against error in the other. He has his sword girded at his side in the Epistle to the Church of Colosse.—Almighty God, in His Wisdom and love, controlled and overruled these evils for endless good to the Colossian Church, and to the Church Universal of every age and country, by the ministry of St. Paul in the present Epistle." DAVIES even suggests, that these errors, as reported to him, gave a stimulus to his thoughts, and made him "aware of depths in the gospel of Christ and of aspects of the Person of Christ which he had not so clearly apprehended before." Certainly these twin Epistles are the most profound of all the Pauline Epistles. This not less so than the other, for here Christ's Person is more prominent, there Christ's Body.—R.]

§ 3. THE AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE.

1. The Epistle itself specifies the Apostle Paul as its author, both in the address (i. 1) and in the text (i. 24), as in Eph. iii. 1 (comp. Introd., § 4), and in the conclusion (iv. 18). It refers to the sufferings he had to endure as an Apostle (i. 29), and especially from the Jews as the Apostle to the Gentiles (iv. 11), to his imprisonment (iv. 3, 10, 18), refers particularly to the same circle of companions, as Philem. 24, men who are known otherwise as his friends, such as *Timothy*

(i. 1), *Epaphras* (i. 7, 8; iv. 12, 13), *Tychicus* (iv. 7–9), *Onesimus* (iv. 9), *Luke* (iv. 14), as well as to two others, *Mark* (iv. 10) and *Demas* (iv. 14), one of whom had been the cause of serious blame and decided contention, indeed of separation from his companion *Barnabas* (Acts xiii. 13; xv. 37–40), while the other afterwards forsook him (2 Tim. iv. 10). Finally the Epistle sets forth the fundamental features of the same errors, which are combatted by the Apostle in the Epistle to the Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles, and yet in such a way that the points of agreement and diversity are readily perceived (§ 4, 5).—Accordingly the Epistle, both in form and contents, bears the stamp of Pauline origin.

2. *The testimony of the early Church*, as in the case of the Epistle to the Ephesians (Introd., § 4, 2) is in favor of the Pauline authorship. The occurrence of πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως (i. 15) in the writings of JUSTIN, who suffered martyrdom A. D. 163, and of THEOPHILUS, Bishop of Antioch, who died A. D. 181, may be of more importance for the history of doctrine, than for historical criticism upon this Epistle, yet the fact must be noted in connection with the testimony of the Canon of MURATORI (Eph. Introd., § 4, 2), which was drawn up about A. D. 160, a catalogue of what was generally received. This cites our Epistle as Pauline. IRENÆUS († 202), who quotes iv. 14, CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS († 220), TERTULLIAN († 220), ORIGEN († 254) cite it as Pauline; EUSEBIUS reckons it among the ὁμολογούμενα. It is even found in the Canon of MARCION, and the Gnostics did not question its genuineness. BÄHR is right in saying: "It could not occur to any considerate person to doubt its genuineness or make a critical plaything of it." [ALFORD: "That this Epistle is a genuine work of St. Paul, was never doubted in ancient times: nor did any modern critic question the fact, until SCHRADER (*der Apostel Paulus*, V. 175 sq.) in his commentary pronounced some passages suspicious, and led the way in which BAUR and MEYERHOFF followed."—R.]

3. MEYERHOFF (*der Brief an die Kolosser mit vornehmlicher Berücksichtigung der drei Pastoralbriefe kritisch geprüft.* 1838) accepts the Epistle to the Ephesians as genuine, to contest the genuineness of that to the Colossians, while BAUR (*Paulus*, 1845, pp. 417–457) rejects both as an unpauline pair. The charge that the language is unpauline fails in view of the "original many-sidedness" (SCHENKEL) of the Apostle; the charge of poverty in thought and quotation from the Epistle to the Ephesians, as well as that of controversy against Cerinthus, are met by correct and discriminating exegesis of the passages in question. If BAUR finds in the false teachers at Colosse, according to this Epistle, later post-apostolic Ebionites, and in its doctrinal drift, as in that of the Gospel of John, a Gnostic tendency, so that it is to be regarded only as a pseudo-apostolic movement of Gnosticism against Ebionitism, it may be replied, that the doctrine respecting Christ as the centre of the entire spiritual world, and the idea of the πλήρωμα are not sufficient to prove the presence of unpauline Gnosticism, since we find here, only that more fully developed and advanced Christology, the foundation of which was already laid in Rom. i. 3, 4; viii. 34; 2 Cor. iv. 4; nor is the opposition to the necessity of circumcision to salvation, and to exaggerated asceticism, evidence of post-pauline origin, since the former had already been opposed in Gal. ii. 3, 4, and the latter in Rom. xiv. 1, 2. The thought that in the death of Christ all diversities and antitheses are abrogated, must not be taken in the sense of a mere external Universalism, separated from the Pauline anthropology and restricted to a coalition of Gentiles and Jews. It is not foreign to the Apostle, but occurs also in Gal. iii. 27, 28; vi. 14, 15, where there is also a reference to baptism as symbolizing death. It would be difficult to receive or justify the opinion, that in the mention of Mark and Luke (iv. 10, 14), there was a purpose of recommending their Gospels and giving prominence to their harmony with each other and with Paul. The open antagonism of the Epistle to the Judaizing tendency directly contradicts the assertion that its main design was to mediate between Jewish and Gentile Christians. Whatever may be peculiar and special in this as compared with other Pauline Epistles, affords no just ground for denying that it is a product of the same author, especially of this vivacious and spirited Apostle.—EWALD (*Sendschreiben des Apostel Paulus*, p. 466 sq.) finds the plan, thoughts and argument Pauline, but takes exception to such words as ἐθελοθρησκεία, ἀνταναπληρόω, to the infrequent use of inferences and causal particles, also to the reference of the reconciling work and death of Christ to angels (i. 20), and hence is of the opinion, that after a preliminary conference about the contents, the composition of the Epistle was left to Timothy as co-author, Paul, how-

ever, dictating the words towards the conclusion and adding his autographic salutation. But according to i. 23, 25; ii. 1, 5, this view is inadmissible, and, notwithstanding 2 Cor. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; Philem. 1; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1, inapplicable to those Epistles also. It will appear from the exegetical remarks that peculiarities of language are not unpauline, because not occurring in antecedent Pauline Epistles.—MEYER, with a reference to ERASMUS (*non est cujusvis hominis Paulinum pectus effingere; tonat, fulgurat, meras flammas loquitur Paulus*), aptly remarks: "The *forging* of such an Epistle as ours would be more wonderful than its genuineness." [For a detailed answer to Meyerhoff's objections, see EADIE, *Liter.* III., though, as he concludes, "the attacks on this Epistle are of no formidable nature." ELLICOTT forcibly remarks: "To class such an Epistle, so marked not only by distinctive peculiarities of style, but by the nerve, force, and originality of its argument, with the vague productions of later Gnosticism, is to bewray such a complete want of critical perception that we can scarcely wonder that such views have been both very generally and very summarily rejected." See DAVIDSON, *Introd.*, Vol. II., p. 427 sq —R.]

§ 4. THE CHURCH AND ITS CIRCUMSTANCES.

1. *Topographical Remarks.* COLOSSE, in the vicinity of Laodicea and Hierapolis, was the locality of the Church addressed in this Epistle. This is evident from ii. 1; iv. 13, 16. The opinion of Erasmus and others, that Rhodes is meant, the inhabitants of which are termed Κολοσσαεῖς, on account of the Colossus, is singular enough [and were there any evidence to support it, the variation in the title of the Epistle (see below) would overthrow it.—R.]

COLOSSE is situated in the southwestern part of Asia Minor, in Greater Phrygia (*Phrygia pacatiana*), on the river Lycus, near the spot where it disappears in a chasm, out of which it soon emerges again to empty itself into the Meander. At the distance of half a day's journey were several populous cities. The most prominent among these, especially in the time of the Romans and in Church History, was Laodicea; STRABO (1st century, A. D) counts it among the μέγισται πόλεις. HERODOTUS calls Colosse: πόλις μεγάλη εὐδαίμων καὶ μεγάλη, but STRABO includes it among the smaller towns (πολίσματα), which lay near Laodicea (THEODORET: μητρόπολις αὐτῆς (Colosse) καὶ γείτων ἡ Λαοδίκεια); though PLINY counts it among the *celeberrimis oppidis*, yet he names it only among the *oppidis*. OROSIUS, who describes the earthquake of the time of Nero in the year 66, mentions Laodicea and Hierapolis first and Colosse last, among the cities affected by it; whether because the smallest, or the least injured by it, is doubtful (*tres urbes—terræ motu conciderunt*). TACITUS misstates the date of the earthquake (60), but expressly mentions Laodicea only, as soon recovering itself without the help of the State or foreign aid, and flourishing anew. THEOPHYLACT († after the middle of the 11th century) calls it Χῶναι; it is now named *Chonas.* [ALFORD: "For a minute and interesting description of the remains and neighborhood, see SMITH'S *Dictionary of Anc. Geography, sub voce.* From what is there said it would appear that Chonæ is in reality about three miles south from the ruins of the city." See also PAULY, *Realencycl.*, Vol. II., p. 518; STEIGER, *Einleitung*, p. 1–33; EADIE, *Col.* p. x., and CONYBEARE and HOWSON, *St. Paul*, Vol. II., p. 383, note, and p. 390, note. The authors last named refer to a legend respecting the opening of the chasm, mentioned above, by the archangel Michael during an inundation from the Lycus, and the church built in his honor, as a curious illustration of the tendency to "angel-worship" rebuked by the Apostle, ii. 18.—R.]

Whether the name should be written: Κολοσσαί or Κολασσαί is doubtful. Codex Sinaiticus [א.] gives the former in the title* and i. 2 (Κολοσσαεῖς), but in the headings of the pages and the subscription Κολασσαεῖς. The former is found upon coins and in classical authors, and seems to be the correct form, the latter appears to be the vulgar form, afterwards the more common one. [All modern editors apparently adopt this explanation of the variation. LACHMANN, TISCHENDORF, ELLICOTT give *a* throughout; ALFORD and WORDSWORTH follow the varied spelling of א. and B.—R.]

2. *Missionary History.* Paul came to Phrygia in his second missionary journey (Acts xvi. 6: "throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia"), also in his third missionary journey (Acts

*[ALFORD, III. *Proleg.* p. 34 and p. 196, 4th ed., gives Κολασσαεῖς as the reading of א. in the title. A consultation of the Imp. Ed. in the Library of the Union Theo. Sem., N. Y., proves the correctness of BRAUNE's statement in every respect.—R.]

xviii. 23: "over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strengthening all the disciples"), visiting the churches which he had founded in his second journey. Hence there is a possibility, or even probability, that Paul had been in the valley of the Meander and Lycus at Laodicea and Colosse, but nothing more, especially as Phrygia had many divisions: Pisidian Phrygia, mountainous Phrygia, the districts of Amorium, Eumenia, Synnada, and the region about and beyond Laodicea to Apamea and yet further. On the contrary our Epistle, in i. 23, where mention must have been made of the fact, if Paul had ever been in Colosse, says nothing of it, but rather expresses (ii. 1), and in several other places (i. 3–7; ii. 5), pre-supposes that Paul had not been there and that the Church had not been founded by him. This takes away all weight from that possibility or probability, which SCHULZ, WIGGERS and others, following THEODORET, have accepted as fact. For the acquaintance with Philemon, Epaphras and other individuals can readily be accounted for; this acquaintance might easily have been formed at Ephesus and other points, in consequence of the extended movement produced by the gospel, or during business journeys made to these points, with which Colosse was connected by commercial ties. [Dr. LARDNER is the principal English supporter of the view that Paul was the founder of the Church; his argument is given in full and answered by EADIE and ALFORD. WORDSWORTH also adopts this view. See his Introduction to the Colossians. BARNES deems it "in the highest degree probable." But it seemed attended with more difficulties than the other view, which is now held by most biblical students. See DAVIDSON, *Introd.*, Vol. II., p. 396 sq.; ALFORD, III. *Proleg.* p. 35 sq.; also EXEG. NOTES on ii. 1.—R.]

3. *Local affairs.* *a*) *Epaphras*, a Colossian (iv. 12: "one of you"), who had probably been won to the gospel by Paul during his two years' residence in Ephesus, which was connected in various ways with the important city of Laodicea, had proclaimed the gospel and founded churches in Colosse, Laodicea and Hierapolis (i. 7; iv. 12, 13). He is certainly no unimportant personage; Paul describes him as his helper (i. 7), refers to his correct teaching (i. 4, 7; ii. 6), to his indefatigable, energetic zeal (iv. 12), which had impelled him not merely to prayer to God (iv. 12) on behalf of the Church, but also to go to the Apostle at Rome and share his imprisonment (i. 8; Philem. 23), and which made him shun no labor for the neighboring churches in Laodicea and Hierapolis also (iv. 13).

b) The *Church* was composed mainly of Gentile Christians (ii. 13), for which reason Paul the Apostle to the Gentiles regarded it also as his Church and labored for it (i. 27; ii. 1, 2. Comp. Rom. xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 15, 16). He had already made or caused to be made to them certain written or oral communications now unknown to us, "touching" Mark (iv. 10). Although allusions to the Mosaic law are not entirely wanting (ii. 10, 13, 14, 16, 21), there is neither quotation, nor proof, nor even a reminiscence from the Old Testament.—Paul praises the Church, which (ii. 16) stands better than the Galatians (Gal. iv. 10), for their Christian deportment (i. 2, 4, 6; ii. 5); his relations with them were altogether undisturbed (i. 8, 25; iv. 7–9, 10); but they needed admonition (i. 9–12; ii. 2, 20; iii. 1–4; iv. 12). False teachers, whom the Church yet in its first love opposed, threatened to ruin it. We cannot, however, infer from iii. 16 that worship had degenerated into lip-service (THEOPHYLACT), nor from iii. 13, that there was variance in heart (SCHENKEL).—The Apostle wrote only "to the saints at Colosse" (i. 2), not "to the Church" (1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1; Gal. i. 2; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1), nor does he add, as in Phil. i. 1, "with the bishops and deacons," but through the Church exhorts a certain Archippus. Ecclesiastical relations seem to be as yet in an incipient state. According to i. 5, 9; ii. 6, the Church had been formed not long before, probably toward the close of Paul's stay in Ephesus, some time before A. D. 60, about four or five years before the Epistle was written; had it been formed earlier, Paul would certainly have visited it from Ephesus.

4. *Ethnography* and *Religious history* give us data respecting the kind of false teachers at Colosse and the consequent danger. The Phrygians, an ancient people, were highly gifted, and surrounded by a corresponding grandeur of nature. They were skilful not only in agriculture and trade, in the manufacture and dyeing of woolen stuffs, but also in arts and sciences, especially in music and the art of healing. Besides the mother-tongue, the language of the Greeks and other neighboring nations were in use among them. They had their grammarians and rhetoricians. Resembling their neighbors, the Ionians, in susceptible, impressible, mo posi-

tion, they readily adopted the various elements of culture. The worship of nature, of the *great mother*, Gaia, of the tower-crowned Cybele, and of Bacchus, was domesticated among them. Here Hellenic Philosophy, which proceeded from the earliest school, the Ionic, and sought the fundamental principle of all things in nature, first in the path of Materialism, then of Idealism, oscillating between Dualism and Pantheism, hostile not to religion, but to Polytheism, came in contact with the Oriental Philosophy. Here the syncretism of that period of transition from the old to the new, Christian age, found ample nourishment. Besides under Antiochus the Great two thousand Jewish families had been transplanted into Phrygia and Lydia. There was in addition a tendency to serious and sombre fanaticism, and to reliance on physical, especially telluric and sidereal influences. [As a further indication of their tendencies, EADIE notes the fact that "the reveries of Montanus originated there about the middle of the second century, and spread rapidly and extensively. The leading features of Montanism were a claim to ecstatic inspiration, the gift of prophecy, the adoption of a transcendental code of morality, and the exercise of an austere discipline. Its votaries were often named Kataphrygians, from the region of their popularity."—R.]

5. With these data we may now learn from the Epistle itself, what was the heresy of the false teachers at Colosse. The polemics of our Epistle point: *First*, to perverted and perverting doctrine *within* the Church (ii. 19: "not holding the Head"), as the admonition also is not respecting apostasy from the Church, but disturbance of the growth in Christ, of the progress in Christian knowledge and Christian life (i. 23; ii. 6). *Secondly*, these false teachers have a Judaistic tendency, they would cling to Jewish laws of food and feasts and seasons (ii. 16), they recommend circumcision (ii. 11) and teach Jewish separatism. *Thirdly*, an asceticism is required, severe and astringent indeed, but *Fourthly*, resting upon a Dualistic view, since it identifies matter with evil, regarding it as eternal, and seeks not sanctification of the life and character by ethical means, but subjugation, mortification of the flesh by physical or chemical or dietetic methods (ii. 23; iii. 6). *Fifthly*, with this is connected the idea that *angels* as *immaterial* beings are objects of adoration (ii. 18), and an Ebionite view of Christ appears, which mistakes and denies His relation to God the Father, to the spiritual world and to creation at large (i. 15, 16, 19; ii. 9), and mistakes and degrades the significance of the objective fact of the crucifixion, that makes peace and reconciliation (i. 20, 22; ii. 14). *Sixthly*, the heresy appeared in the form of a speculation, adapted to the spirit of the age, with the pretensions of a system, which would profoundly, acutely and triumphantly present the entire truth (ii. 8, 18).

Accordingly we are not to regard them as Jews, either with Pharisaical tendencies (EICHHORN) or with a syncretic leaning to Christianity after the manner of the Chaldean Magi or Alexandrian Neo-Platonists (HUG, SCHNECKENBURGER), or as Essenes (CHEMNITZ, FLATT, THIERSCH and others). Nor can we regard them as heathen philosophers in general (TERTULLIAN), or in particular as Epicureans (CLEMENS ALEX.), Pythagoreans (GROTIUS), Platonists or Stoics (HEUMANN); nor yet as Gnostics who represented a definite system. Nor was *Cerinthus* intended (MEYERHOFF), nor Ebionite Gnosticism (BAUR), and Cabbalism (HERDER, OSIANDER) as little. The errors were rather incipient, occasioned by the thoughts, with which the atmosphere of both the age and the people was charged. This much is true: that in Simon Magus we have a personage, in whom the attempt had been made at a systematic combination of Christianity with the Oriental theosophy (PRESSENSE: *Die ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, 2, pp. 128–136); he is the first heretic and Cerinthus the next. But in our Epistle, as in those to the Ephesians, to Timothy and Titus, all is still in flow; here and in the Epistle to the Ephesians as yet within the Church, in the pastoral Epistles without it, and afterwards more widely, sharply and solidly developed. [EADIE: The winged seeds were floating in the atmosphere, and falling into a soil adapted to them, and waiting as if to receive them; in course of years they produced an ample harvest.—R.] Comp. MANGOLD: *Die Irrlehrer der Pastoralbriefe*, 1856. [See DAVIDSON, *Introd.*, Vol. II., pp. 407–424, and EADIE, *Introd. to Col.* Comp. DAVIES' *Essay on the traces of foreign elements in the doctrine of* this and cotemporaneous Pauline Epistles. The same author says: "a meeting of the Persic or Zoroastrian religion with Judaism was sufficient to account for all the dangerous teaching referred to in the Epistle to the Colossians—traces of such a meeting are to be found in the Jewish literature antecedent to the time of Christ." As he indicates

that this is the germ of subsequent Gnosticism, he uses it to oppose those who claim a post-apostolic date for this Epistle, on the ground of its opposition to Gnosticism, Whatever may have been the origin of these theosophic tendencies, Phrygia was the region where Judaism and Orientalism would most readily combine in errors such as are opposed by the Apostle.—R.]

§ 5. TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

Compare § 2, 1 and INTROD. to *Eph.* § 6.

[Braune there claims priority for the Epistle to the Ephesians Undoubtedly both were written about the same time. Which was first is almost entirely a matter of conjecture. Yet the probabilities, as set forth in the Introd. to the Ephesians, outweigh those drawn from "the nature of the contents of this Epistle" by ALFORD, ELLICOTT and DAVIDSON. "The more directly systematic and doctrinal" Epistle might precede quite as readily, as "the more directly individualizing and polemical" one.—R.]

§ 6. LITERATURE OF THE EPISTLE.

Besides the more general works mentioned Introd. Eph., § 7, the following must be named: MELANCHTHON: *Enarratio epistolæ Pauli ad Col. Corpus Reform* XV. pp. 1221–1282.—JUNKER: *Histor. krit. und philol. Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Kolosser*, 1828.—BÖHMER: *Isagoge in ep. a Paulo ad Col. data theologica, historica, critica*, 1829, and *Theologische Auslegung* of the same Epistle, 1835.—Especially we mention: BÄHR: *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Kolosser*, 1835.—STEIGER: *Kleine Paulinische Briefe*, Thl. I.: *Der Brief an die Kolosser*, 1835.—HUTHER: *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Kolosser*, 1841.—Compare also: RHEINWALD: *De pseudo doctoribus Colossensibus*, 1834.—SCHNECKENBURGER: *Besträge zur Einleitung in's N. T.*—Besides the practical expositions which include this Epistle (Introd. Eph. § 7): STEINHOFER: *Tägliche Nahrung des Glaubens aus der Erkenntniss Jesu nach den lehrhaften Zeugnissen des Briefs an die Kolosser.*—SCHLEIERMACHER: Sermons on the Colossians (*Works*, Vol. II. 6, pp. 191–401).—KÄHLER: 36 *Betrachtungen über den Brief Pauli an die Kolosser.*—PASSAVANT: *Praktische Auslegung des Briefes Pauli an die Kolosser* (a posthumous work), 1865.

[For a list of commentaries on the whole Bible and the New Testament, see LANGE's *Com. on Matthew*, General Introd. p. 19. Of especial value for this Epistle: CALVIN, DE WETTE, MEYER, BENGEL, HENRY, BARNES, ALFORD, WORDSWORTH. On the Epistles of St. Paul: MACKNIGHT, CONYBEARE and HOWSON (London and New York). Of special English works, the oldest are BYFIELD: *Expos. Col.*, London, 1615.—ELTON: *Exposition*, London, 1620.—BISHOP DAVENANT (member of the Synod of Dort): Learned and exhaustive prelections in Latin, 1727 (translated into English, 1831).—DAILLE, *Sermons*, translated by John Owen, 1672, also Edinb., 1865, and Philadelphia, Presb. B. Pub.—WATSON: *Practical Discourses*, 1834.—Bishop DAN. WILSON, *Expository Lectures*, London, 1845, with special reference to prevailing errors.—CARTWRIGHT: *Notes of Sermons*, Edinb., 1864. These are all mainly practical.—Later exegetical works of great value: EADIE: *Commentary on the Greek Text of the Colossians*, London and Glasgow, 1856. (Very full and reliable.)—ELLICOTT: *Critical and Grammatical Commentary on Philippians, Colossians and Philemon, with a revised translation*, London and Andover, from 2d Eng. ed., 1865. (Clear, discriminating and judicious, fully sustaining the author's reputation as a critic, grammarian and exegete, largely used in the additions to the present work.) —J. LLEWELYN DAVIES: *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians, the Colossians and Philemon; with introductions and notes, and an essay on the traces of foreign elements in the theology of these Epistles*, London, 1866. (An attempt to use the Oriental studies so common in England in elucidating these Epistles which seem to have encountered ancient Oriental tendencies.)—There are no special American works on this Epistle.—R.]

EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS.*

I. ADDRESS AND SALUTATION.

Chapter I. 1, 2.

1 Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ [Christ Jesus][1] by the will of God, and Timo-
2 theus *our* [ὁ, the] brother, To the saints and faithful [or believing] brethren in
Christ which [who] are at Colosse:[2] [.] Grace *be* unto you, and peace, from God
our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.[3]

* Title: Πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς, ℵ. and others; πρὸς Κολασσαεῖς, A. B. K. and others. [The latter is adopted here by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth. Alford incorrectly cites ℵ. in support of the latter reading, both in his *apparatus criticus* and *Proleg.* p. 34, Vol. III.—R.] Comp. Introd. § 4. 1.

[1] Ver. 1.—Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ in ℵ. A. B. F. G. [Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott.—R.]; better supported therefore than Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

[2] Ver. 2.—Κολοσσαεῖς is to be retained on the authority of ℵ. B. D. F. L. (Alford, Wordsworth): Κολασσ. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Ellicott. The order of the E. V. is not that of the original: "To the saints in Colosse and believing brethren in Christ."—R.]

[3] Ver. 2.—Καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, wanting in no other Pauline salutation, occurring in precisely the same form (except in the pastoral Epistles), is sustained by ℵ. A. C. E. G. and others, but omitted by other important authorities and critics (Tischendorf). The original absence of the phrase is less explicable than the subsequent omission in some MSS. [Rejected by Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1. 2a. Address. **Paul, an Apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God.**—See Eph. i. 1. To this church, not founded by himself and to its false teachers, he thus defines his official position as the Apostle called immediately by the ascended Son of God: hence "Christ Jesus."

And Timotheus the brother.—On this see Van Oesterzee (Lange's *Commentary*) 1 Timothy. The same phrase is added, Philem. 1. and 2 Cor. i. 1; in 1 Cor. i. 1: "and Sosthenes the brother"; Phil. i. 1: "Paul and Timotheus, servants of Jesus Christ"; 1 Thess. i. 1 and 2 Thess. i. 1: "Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus"; Gal. i. 1, 2: "Paul an Apostle—and all the brethren that are with me." Since "my" is not added as in Rom. xvi. 21, "Timotheus my workfellow," this last passage compels us to understand the word ἀδελφός in the simple sense of "Christian brother," with no more special relation to Paul, than that of one Christian to another (as ver. 2, ἀδελφοῖς). The Apostle writes, not merely in virtue of his peculiar authority as an Apostle, but together with tried associates; he includes with himself his helpers and friends. To him the Christian brother is a friend and assistant, with whom he has consulted and now acts respecting the case of this church, without resigning or impairing his independence (i. 24; ii. 1; iv. 7). Timothy is not on this account the writer of the Epistle, which Paul dictates to him (Steiger), else according to Rom. xvi. 22, Tertius should have been named in the address, Rom. i. 1; and must each of the Epistles to the Thessalonians have been dictated to two persons? or the Epistle to the Galatians to the whole circle of Paul's companions? for Gal. vi. 11 is the usual autograph salutation. See Schmoller *in loco* (Lange's *Commentary*, Gal.) and Laurent: *Neutestamentliche Studien*, p. 4 sq. Nor can Timothy be regarded as the dispatcher of the Epistle (Schenkel), and certainly ὁ ἀδελφός does not mean "fellow Apostle" (Chrysostom: οὐκοῦν καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπόστολος). [So Theophylact. Wordsworth, supporting the view that Paul was the founder of the Colossian church, says: "In the case of all the *other* Epistles, where Timothy is thus introduced, it is certain that he had been with St. Paul at the places, and was well known to the churches to which those Epistles were sent." "If Timothy had not been at Colosse, it is hardly probable that, being still a young man, he would have been associated with the Apostle in this address to the Colossian church." "This opinion is also confirmed by the words ὁ ἀδελφός, *the brother*, signifying that he was well known to them as such, and was *their* own brother as well as St. Paul's.

Timothy is introduced as 'Timothy *the brother*' in the Epistle to *Philemon*, who lived at Colosse." EADIE:—"So well known was he as 'the brother,' doing the Apostle's work, carrying his messages, bringing correspondence to him, endeared to him in so many ways, and representing him in his absence, that the church of Colosse could not wonder at his name being associated with that of Paul."—R.]

Ver. 2. **To the saints in Colosse.**—See Eph. i. 1. [See BEVERIDGE, Vol. VI. Serm. II., p. 401, where he answers the question, "What is it to be a saint?"—R.]—**And faithful brethren in Christ.**—After defining their relation toward God, the relation of the members of the church to each other is noted in the word "brethren." This is one, mediated and maintained by Christ, while the adjective πιστοῖς describes its internal, true and vital character. At all events "in Christ" must be joined with "brethren" or better with "saints," ἁγίοις, here used as a substantive, and hence having the local attribute joined to it; it must not be joined to πιστοῖς, which is not = faithful (STEIGER). [The E. V. might be amended—to read "believing" instead of "faithful," but the ordinary reader would then be more likely to regard "in Christ" as connected with it rather than with "brethren" or "saints." Alford joins ἐν Χριστῷ to ἀδελφοῖς and suggests, to account for the omission of the article before ἐν Χ. that the idea ἀδελφὸς-ἐν-Χριστῷ was familiar.—R.] A comparison with Eph. i. 1, 2, shows, amid all the similarity, the unmistakable original independence.

Ver. 2b. *The Greeting.* **Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.**—Comp. Eph. i. 2. [The final phrase, hitherto rejected by most modern editors, has found a new and important support from Cod. Sinaiticus. While the reason given in the critical note for retaining it should have due weight, the testimony of CHRYSOSTOM and THEOPHYLACT must not be disregarded: "Yet in this place he does not insert the name of Christ."—THEOPHYLACT adds: "Although it is his usual way to insert it." The reason he subjoins: "Lest the Apostle should revolt them at the outset, and turn their minds from his forthcoming argument," EADIE properly terms "silly;"—especially since, as WORDSWORTH, referring to Chrysostom, remarks: "It is observable that in the beginning of this Epistle—addressed to a church where the name of Jesus Christ was disparaged by many, and written in order to vindicate His Dignity—the Apostle repeats the word Christ four times"—not including this instance, where both adopt the briefer reading.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

All Christians are brethren. In addition to the remarks on Eph. i. 1, 2, one thing must here be noted; the fact that Paul, the Apostle of Christ Jesus, describes with the same name of *brother*, Timothy, whom he places beside himself, and the Colossian Christians to whom he writes with apostolic authority. From this we infer:

1. The Church founded by Jesus Christ is presented to our view as a "family of God," in which all the members are children of God and brethren to each other.

2. Compared with the difference from God, all differences between the members so far disappear that all are simply brethren.

3. Even in the organism of the church those members, distinguished immediately and by special authority, do not pass out of this fraternal relation; that most important office of the church, the apostolate, is but an accident of the brotherhood; the Christian position is the basis of position in the Church and surpasses it.

4. On fraternal fellowship and love depend all relations of life, all the gradations of that fundamental form which God has established in the earthly human community; each should feel that he is incorporated in the family.

5. True fraternity is not the result of natural family feeling, nor of any form of human community, but the product of God's Spirit in Christ.

6. But the brotherly love, which embraces all united in the faith, does not in the New Testament mode of life make the special personal relation of friendship stand out more sharply; the disciple of Christ has none other as friend than the disciple of Christ, but has all, who are such, without distinction as friends. Yet as soon as the church is enlarged numerically, there must naturally appear, within the great circle, personal affinities, and chosen companionship. Notwithstanding what is remarked above, biblical justification of these is not wanting, since the Lord Himself chose three of the Twelve to be nearest to Himself, and of these but one leaned on the bosom of Jesus. So Paul, among many whom he loved, had no one so "like-minded" as Timothy (Phil. ii. 20), and in the beginning of the apostolic history we see Peter and John more closely united together than to the others (PALMER: *Moral*, p. 400 sq.).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

If we can pray "Our Father," we are and we have brethren. "Father" bids us know and feel and conduct ourselves as children, "our" as brethren.

STARKE:—First, we must be certain of the will of God, then we must follow it cheerfully, whether the world look sweet or sour.—We must not think that we alone can do all, so that nothing goes right but what we alone do. Each must be of such a mind, as to bear a helper beside him.—Whoever fears the Lord from childhood and diligently uses God's Word, like Timothy may soon become a man in Christ, though in years still a youth.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—The Scriptures know nothing of those who were especially saints, preeminent above others, but all who through Christ are brought back into living fellowship with God, are saints.

[PASSAVANT:—It is not: *believers on Christ*, but *in Christ;* the Apostle views Christians as through faith firmly founded *in Christ*, vitally and deeply rooted in His heavenly Being, members of His body, flesh of His flesh, and spirit of His Spirit, life from His life.—*On the greeting.* Notice everywhere in the writings of the New Testament and especially in the Epistles of Paul, this thorough,

unsearchable and indissoluble union of the Father and the Son; from eternity one Being, one Life, one Work of one Eternal Power and Love—and in this Eternal Blessed unity of the Father and the Son was from the beginning decreed and provided and bestowed all that should become to us the *peace* of eternity: the grace coming unto us.—RIEGER:—Fellowship with God through faith makes saints, fellowship with one another makes brethren in Christ.—HENRY:—He thought himself engaged to do his utmost, as an Apostle, because he was made so by the will of God.—As all good ministers, so all good Christians are *brethren* one to another—toward God they must be *saints*, and in both *faithful*.—SCHENKEL:—Why Christians are called saints: 1) how humbling, 2) how exalting this designation.—R.]

[Christians are brethren, whatever difference of age or opinion (Paul and Timothy), in spite of distance and degrees of knowledge and piety (Paul and the Colossians); because all are "brethren in Christ."—R.]

II. FIRST PART.

Mention of the ground of Christian fellowship and warning against apostasy.

CHAPTER I. 3—II. 23.

1. Thanks to God for the faith and love of his readers from the beginning.

(CHAPTER I. 3–8).

3 We give thanks to God and [omit and][1] the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying
4 always [always, when praying] for you,[2] Since we heard of your faith in Christ
5 Jesus, and of the love which ye have[3] to all the saints, For [on account of] the hope
which is laid up for you in heaven, whereof ye heard before in the word of the truth
6 of the gospel; Which is come unto you [lit.: is present unto you], as *it* is in all the
world; and[4] bringeth forth fruit [is bringing forth fruit and increasing],[5] as *it doth*
[*it is*] also in [among] you, since the day ye heard *of it* [it], and knew the grace of
7 God in truth: As ye also [Even as ye][6] learned of Epaphras our dear fellow servant,
8 who is for you[7] a faithful minister of Christ; Who also declared unto us your love
in the Spirit.

[1] Ver. 3.—Θεῷ πατρί, B. C. and other MSS. and the oldest versions. ℵ. [with A. K. L.] and others insert καί, as in Eph. i. 3; Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 3; xi. 31 in a similar connexion; here it is an interpolation. [Τῷ πατρί is another reading, not well supported. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott (though not with perfect confidence) reject καί; Wordsworth retains it.—R.]

[2] Ver. 3.—Περί, ℵ. A. C. [K. L., Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth—R.], the less supported ὑπέρ [Lachmann—R.] probably from ver. 9, and because more significant. [See EXEG. NOTES on the above emendation.—R.]

[3] Ver. 4.—Ἣν ἔχετε, ℵ. A. C. and others, supported by the context, [so all recent editors—R.]; τήν is poorly supported, probably from Eph. i. 15. [The italics of the E. V. are therefore unnecessary.—R.]

[4] Ver. 6.—Καὶ ἔστιν on the authority of F. G. K. L. and the oldest versions, supported by the context. [Tischendorf, Meyer, De Wette. Ellicott.—R.] Καί is omitted in ℵ. A. B. C. and others [by Lachmann, Alford, Wordsworth—R.], and is the less difficult reading.

[5] Ver 6.—[Καὶ αὐξανόμενον, supplied on the authority of ℵ. A. B. C. D.[1] F. L., many versions and all modern editors.—R.]

[7] Ver. 7.—After καθώς, ℵ. A. B. C. D. omit καί. It is a "mechanical repetition" from ver. 6. [So modern editors. E. V. retains it in "also," which should be omitted. Καθώς = "even as," here (Ellicott).—R.]

[7] Ver. 7.—Ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, C. E. F. K. L. and ℵ. corrected and in nearly all versions. The otherwise well supported ἡμῶν, ℵ. A. B., is an error of the transcriber, accounted for by the prevalence of the first person. [Tischendorf, Ellicott, Wordsworth. Alford, quoting Ambrosiaster (4th century, *vice apostoli*), reads ἡμῶν, following Lachmann.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The immediate object of thanksgiving (vers. 3-5). Ver. 3. **We give thanks.**—As a rule the Apostle begins with thanksgiving; this is precisely as in 1 Thess. i. 2; but in 1 Cor. i. 4, though the address reads: "Paul—and Sosthenes," we find εὐχαριστῶ (so also Phil i. 1-3). The plural is not then conditioned by the mention of Timothy in the address (MEYER, SCHENKEL), yet it is not = εὐχαριστῶ (BAEHR). Plural and singular forms are not used arbitrarily by the Apostle; the choice depended upon the predominance of the Apostle's individual feeling, or of the common sentiment of those participating: and this certainly includes not merely him or those named in the address, but the church in the house or place where the Apostle was. [ELLICOTT says: "we, *i. e.*, I and Timothy," but intimates that the context always fully accounts for the selection of singular or plural. So EADIE, ALFORD. CONYBEARE contends for the singular meaning of the plural throughout all the Epistles—which is inadmissible.—R.]

To God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.—See Eph. i. 3.—**Praying always fo'**

you defines more particularly "we give thanks;" the participle marks the thanksgiving as part of the prayer, and the adverb renders it prominent, that the former was never wanting in the latter. "Always" is not to be joined with the participle "praying" (GREEK FATHERS, BENGEL, LUTHER, etc.) [ALFORD, ELLICOTT, E. V. The majority of modern commentators join it with the verb,—EADIE renders: "We bless God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ always, when praying for you."—R.] Still less is "for you" to be joined with "we give thanks" (BAEHR). The latter cannot be decided by Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 2, while the former opinion is confirmed by Eph. i. 16. On the difference between περί and ὑπέρ, see Eph. v. 2; vi. 18.

Ver. 4. *The occasion of thanksgiving.*—**Since we heard,** ἀκούσαντες.—This second participle (aorist) sets forth what had preceded the thanksgiving, while the first one (present) appends what had accompanied it. See WINER'S *Gram.* p. 323.* The plural here marks the fact as publicly known, not merely made known to the Apostle and his friends.

Of your faith in Christ Jesus, and the love which ye have to all the saints.—"Your faith in Christ Jesus" is the first ground of this thanksgiving; your faith, resting on Christ, moving itself in Him; the phrase "in Christ Jesus" limits "faith" as Eph. i. 15, not ὑμῶν (DE WETTE). The preposition does not affect the meaning of "faith," so that it becomes "believing constancy" (LUTHER), but it only denotes that the object is to be regarded, not as the end of effort (εἰς), but as the element and ground. [ELLICOTT: "In Him as the sphere or sub-stratum of the πίστις, that in which the faith centres itself. The omission of the article gives a more complete unity to the conception, 'Christ-centred faith.'" ALFORD: "the immediate element of their faith, not its distinctive character, is the point brought out."—R.] On the remainder of the clause, "and of the love which ye have to all the saints," see Eph. i. 15.—[The reading: ἣν ἔχετε carries "more affectionate commendation" (ALFORD) than the simple article of the Rec. It draws attention to the love and points to its persistence (ELLICOTT).—R.]

Ver. 5: describes this love more closely.—**On account of the hope which is laid up for you in heaven.**—[Joined to "love."—R.] Since διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα is joined grammatically to ἣν ἔχετε, Paul has not written ἀγάπην τήν as in the parallel passage, Eph. i. 15, but subjoined the relative clause. "The hope" is characterized by the clause "which is laid up for you in heaven," as objective, like the ἐλπὶς βλεπομένη (Rom. viii. 24), "that which is hoped for," which is preserved, set aside (ἀπό), *in deposito reconditum* (LÖSNER), as a securely placed treasure (CHRYSOSTOM: τὸ ἀσφαλὲς ἔδειξεν; BENGEL: *sine periculo*), or rather as a reward and prize according to 2 Tim. iv. 8; 1 Pet. i. 4; Matt. xix. 21; comp. Heb. ix. 27; vi. 18. On "in heaven," see Eph. i. 10. Accordingly this hope gives a motive for the love in its activity as well as its extent; it does not depend upon the present, on temporal life and possessions, nor on the men, the brethren whom it reaches. It is certain of the eternal, heavenly, divine possessions and salvation, and has in these enough. "Hope" is not therefore the third with "faith" and "love" (STEIGER and others), nor does it furnish a motive for faith (BAEHR and others); least of all for the thanksgiving (BENGEL: "from the hope is manifest how great the ground of thanksgiving for the gift of faith and love"). [So EADIE, BARNES. The E. V.—"for the hope" seems obscure. Both "on account of" (EADIE, ALFORD), and "because of" (ELLICOTT), leave the reader uncertain as to the connection, which is the main difficulty here.—R.]

Whereof ye heard before, ἣν προηκούσατε.—In the ἅπαξ λεγόμενον: προακούειν, according to the context the πρό refers to the object, "the hope laid up" which is future and concealed. MEYER is therefore incorrect: before you had this hope; HEINRICHS: *alio doctore* (*Epaphra*) *ante me;* BÖHMER, HUTHER: before the Epistle was written; SCHENKEL: before he had received tidings of their faith. The interpretation (GROTIUS): *prima rudimenta accepistis,* as if προακούειν described the first instruction of catechumens, is unwarranted. [Braune seems to follow DE WETTE and OLSHAUSEN in their view of the force of "before," "before the fulfilment of the hope," but as EADIE well remarks "such an exegesis is a species of truism." ELLICOTT: "not before any definite epoch, but merely at some undefined period in the past," "formerly."—EADIE gives the sense of "*already,*" as intimating that this hope had been made prominent in preaching, and they of course heard of this in hearing the gospel; a view to be preferred as giving more point to the passage and fully accordant with the context.—R.] To "laid up in heaven" corresponds what is joined to "heard before," viz:

In the word of the truth of the gospel—through which the "hearing before" has its guarantee. This expression is another briefer and independent setting forth of Eph. i. 13, "after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation." The hearing before of the hope is mediated by the preaching (ἐν τῷ λόγῳ) of the truth (τῆς ἀληθείας), which is the substance of the λόγος, but is taken out of nothing other than the gospel (τοῦ εὐαγγελίου), to which the truth belongs. It is not proper to follow the parallel passage, which is grammatically different, and take "of the gospel" as a genitive of apposition to "in the word of truth" (STEIGER), or to "the truth" (BAEHR), [ELLICOTT: "a defining genitive, allied to the genitive *possessivus* (genitive *continentis*), which specifies, and so to say, localizes the general notion of the governing substantive: 'the truth which was preached in and was announced in the gospel'".—R.] Nor is "the word of the truth"=*sermo verax* (ERASMUS), or "the preaching of truth" (HUTHER, BLEEK), nor "of the truth of the gospel"=genuine gospel (STORR), nor is λόγος defined as to its substance by ἀληθείας as absolute truth, as to its form by εὐαγγέλιον as "proclamation of salvation" (SCHENKEL).

The deeper cause of thanksgiving (vers. 6–8). Ver. 6. **Which has come unto you**—*lit.*, is present unto you This is spoken of the gospel

* [The original references are to the 6th German edition; altered throughout to the 7th German ed., 1867.—R.]

Παρών notes its being present (1 Cor. v. 3; 2 Cor. xiii. 10); with *πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, 2 Cor. xi. 8; Gal. iv. 18, 20, here *εἰς ὑμᾶς*. In the passages quoted the Apostle stands before them, turned towards them; here he speaks of the gospel, that penetrates into them; he describes the steady, constant and finally entire penetration of the gospel, which is not forced through with one blow. [The preposition conveys the idea of its having *reached* them, the participle implies its abiding there (ELLICOTT).—R.] The added clause: **as it is in all the world**, renders prominent the simple fact of the presence of the gospel in the world. The preposition *ἐν* marks the distinction between its presence in the world, and in Colosse, where it has already wrought what it should and would. "In all the world" indicates the whole world as the field, in which the gospel is found and which it will permeate. It is not confined to one part, had already begun is efficacy in the most diverse places, among Jews and Gentiles. Hence it is no synecdoche, "meaning the most noted parts of the world, as Rom. i. 8; x. 18" (GROTIUS), nor only the Roman Empire, nor popular hyperbole (MEYER). [ALFORD: "No hyperbole, but the pragmatic repetition of the Lord's parting command.—R.]

And is bringing forth fruit and increasing.—[ALFORD, omitting *καί*, calls the paragraph broken and unbalanced.—R.] It is not merely *in* all the world, but efficient there also. We have here the usual transition from the participial construction to that of the finite verb (WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 505 sq.); the participle with *εἶναι* indicates continuance and duration (WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 326 sq.). [So in English, hence the literal rendering: "is bringing forth fruit and increasing" is preferable.—R.] THEODORET: *καρποφορίαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κέκληκε τὴν ἐπαινουμένην πολιτείαν, αὔξησιν δὲ τῶν πιστευόντων τὸ πλῆθος.* The figure is borrowed from a tree which both bears fruit and grows (Matt. vii. 17; xiii. 32; Luke xiii. 19). The former word refers to the faith, the love, the Christian virtues, which the gospel produces in the internal and external life, the latter to the extension and the multiplication of its adherents (Acts vi. 7; xii. 24; xix. 20). [The former the *intensive*, the latter the *extensive* progress of the gospel. ELLICOTT.—R.]—**As it is also among you**, introduces Colosse as a part of the field, in which the gospel is and is working ("in all the world"), and furnishes a proof that the gospel is, and how it is, "in all the world." Hence *ἐν ὑμῖν* is "among you," not "in you" (LUTHER). "Bringing forth fruit and increasing" must be supplied. ["*It doth*," supplied in E. V., is to be changed to "*it is*," to correspond with the participial form of the verb in the former clause.—R.]

Since the day ye heard it, and knew the grace of God in truth.—[Braune, following DE WETTE, supplies no object after "heard," making "the grace of God" the object of both verbs. MEYER, STEIGER, EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, supply: "the gospel," which is to be preferred. E. V. "of it," is unsatisfactory; they must have heard the gospel, as well as heard of it, before it would bring forth fruit among them.—R.] On the construction *ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας*, see WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 130. The first proclamation of the gospel was followed by the acceptance of it, and from that time forth the Christian life and character of the Church developed internally and externally in constant progress. The object is "the grace of God," the substance of the *evangelical* preaching (ver. 5), the marrow of the gospel over against the law. "In truth" is an adverbial qualification of the verbs "heard" and "knew." The gospel is proclaimed *vere et sincere absque fuco*, *οὐκ ἐν ἀπάτῃ καὶ λόγοις εἰκαίοις** (GREEK FATHERS), and is accepted *non simulate, sed vere.* It implies a contrast to the false teachers and is not = *ἀληθῶς*, "truly," nor to be joined with "grace" (STORR and others), nor = in the gospel (GROTIUS) [BARNES.—R.]. Nor is it to be joined only to "knew" (MEYER and others), nor to "heard" alone (BAEHR and others). [ALFORD: "in its truth, and with true knowledge." So EADIE: "the words *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ* describe the teaching of Epaphras, or represent that genuine form, in which, by his preaching, the grace of God had been exhibited at Colosse." This makes it qualify the verb "knew." and at the same time define "the grace of God" by presenting the element, in which the gospel was proclaimed.—R.]

Ver. 7. **Even as ye learned of Epaphras.**—*Καθώς* refers to "in truth" [ALFORD: "in which truth"—R.], and describes the manner in which they had learned from Epaphras. The verb, the object of which must be "the grace of God," marks the intermediate step between "hearing" and "knowing" and describes the earnest, constant effort of the Colossians, to which the activity of Epaphras corresponds.—Epaphras a Colossian or Phrygian (iv. 12: "one of you"), with Paul in his imprisonment (Philem. 23: "my fellow prisoner"), is not identical with Epaphroditus, the Macedonian, a preacher of Philippi † (Phil. ii. 25; iv. 18), as GROTIUS arbitrarily assumes; here indicated as the founder of the Church in Colosse, but otherwise entirely unknown to us. Even should we accept the reading *καί* before *ἐμάθετε*, we could not, with WIGGERS,‡ treat it as though it were *καὶ ἀπὸ Ἐπαφρᾶ* (as in Rom. v. 7; Eph. iv. 4), in order thus to maintain that there had been a proclamation of the gospel in Colosse before that of Epaphras. Still less does the *καθώς* resume the preceding *καθὼς ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ*, as though Epaphras had only told that the gospel was every where proclaimed (THEODORET). The preposition *ἀπό* indicates that the Colossians had gladly met Epaphras and heard him speak. The words which follow are a confirmation of the preaching of Epaphras: **our dear fellow servant, who is for you a faithful minister of Christ.**—"Our dear fellow servant" describes him in his position toward Christ (*δοῦλος*) [no thought of his imprisonment with Paul (CONYBEARE)—R.], and toward Paul with his helpers (*συν—ἡμῶν*), and in his relation to them (*ἀγαπητοῦ*), as an excellent minister, who, entirely dependent on the Lord, and independent of men, labored as a colleague with the Apostle and his

* ["Truly and sincerely, without dissimulation, not in deceit and rash words."—R.]

† [CONYBEARE. II. 385: "Epaphras is the same name with Epaphroditus" (?)—"but this can scarcely be the same person." *etc.*—R.]

‡ [*Studien und Kritiken*. 1838. p. 185.—R.]

fellow laborers, especially for the Church at Colosse (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν), from the beginning, with proper fidelity (ὅς ἐστιν πιστός) in the service of Christ (διάκονος Χριστοῦ). [The reading of the Rec., ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, "for you," "on your behalf," is not only better supported, but avoids the repetition of the other reading, while it is as strong a commendation of Epaphras to the Colossians, to say that he had been a faithful minister of Christ for them, as to say that he had been faithful *vice apostoli*.—R.]

Ver. 8. **Who also declared unto us your love in the Spirit.**—The declaration is made prominent. Epaphras has not only seen in Colosse, but spoken in Rome to Paul in a detailed, perspicuous way, as a witness respecting "your love in the Spirit." The love was "not carnal, but spiritual" (ŒCUMENIUS), "fruit of the Spirit" (Gal. v. 22: Rom. xv. 30); Spirit is of course the Holy Spirit (as Rom. xiv. 17). Hence it is not the spirit of man, the inner man, nor a "love which depends on an internal sentiment and disposition, a love sincere and earnest" (`A LAPIDE, BÖHMER and others), and since the context must decide what is the object of the love, it is to be regarded as "love of the brethren" (ver. 4), including love to the Apostle, but not this latter exclusively (BAEHR, BLEEK and others); the following "we also" at least cannot decide this to be the meaning, since the Apostle does not pray merely in reciprocity. It is improper to join ἐν πνεύματι with δηλώσας (WAHL), as though Epaphras had narrated it through inspiration, or to explain it, *per spiritum sanctum* (GROTIUS). [EADIE properly expounds "love" as denoting the Christian grace of love, hence "in the Spirit." ALFORD: "the chief gift of the Spirit," "thus in the elemental region of the Spirit;" ELLICOTT: "genuine and operative only in the sphere of His blessed influence."—R.]

It is unmistakably the object of Paul in this honoring description, to establish as firmly as possible in every direction the authority of Epaphras; his doctrine is right, his relations to the Apostle hearty and intimate, his interest for the Colossians active and pure, undisturbed from the first. He seems to have been suspected by the false teachers. Paul gives prominence to these facts, in order to shame the errorists, to warn and guard the Church against them; for their sake and that of the cause, he enters particularly upon the efficiency and conduct of Epaphras. ESTIUS: "Lest they might suffer themselves to be led away from the doctrine which they had learned from him by new teachers."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Faith* and *Love* are the chief points, in judging of the condition of the Christian Church. Faith must not only be directed *to* (εἰς) Christ, but be a life *in* (ἐν) Christ; it is the foundation and source of love, by which it worketh [Gal. v. 6.—R.]. This love must be "in the Spirit" (ver. 8), that it may be pure, and extend "to all the saints" (ver. 4), that it may be large-hearted, not limited by sensuous, arbitrary and selfish sympathies. Living, active faith in Christ alone leads to such purity and extent of love, because the believer has first of all love to God, the Father of Jesus Christ (and through Him his Father), and from a faith on the love of God in Christ, which enjoys the love of the Father and Son, he gains a love to all, in whom the same faith is active, who have become and still are the objects of the same mercy, altogether irrespective of the stage of results accomplished, however manifold the degrees of its strength may be. It overleaps party lines and difference of creeds, and prays in truth: Our Father, which art in heaven. In "*Father*" lies the doctrine of *faith*, in "our" the ethics of *love*, in "which art in heaven," the impulse and motive of *hope*.

2. *The activity of this love*, growing out of faith, which embraces all Christians as brethren, as children of the Father, has its mainspring in the hope of salvation, secure for us in heaven. This is *Christian eudæmonism*, which indeed has in view the salvation of our own souls, the perfection and blessedness of our own personality, yet not selfishly, but seeks and knows in fellowship with all believers; nor yet externally, sensualistically, like a Turk or heathen German, but internally, in the spirit of the mind; nor yet here, but in heaven, not in time, but in eternity, hence not as a materialist or atheist burning for good fortune and earthly pleasure; and finally not in our own strength, as it has been attempted "in godless virtue," but as a gift of the gracious God through Christ.

3. *Faith grows from the preached word of gospel truth.* Since faith as to its essence is God's word become living in the heart of man, since it grows out of this word as from a seed, its establishment and growth depends altogether upon the preaching of this word of God (λόγος, ver. 5), which alone contains the truth indispensably necessary for the soul, presenting the grace of God, which is the marrow of the gospel (ver. 5: τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ver. 6: τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ). This and not the preaching (SCHENKEL) is the vital principle of Christianity, which penetrates ever more deeply into the believers, producing in them and in the life of the church the fruits of virtues, both active and passive, ever extending more widely, ever permeating more thoroughly every one and all things (ver. 6). ["To keep the figure of the Apostle, it was like a tree, whose fruit, falling to the earth, germinated, so that there sprang up a youthful and healthy forest on all sides of it" (EADIE).—R.] Preaching is only the principal means, to which we must hold fast in simplicity and freedom from all perversion, deterioration or obscuration.

4. *The teachers or preachers of the gospel* must labor as belonging to Christ, as entirely dependent on Him (ver. 7: δοῦλος) yet attached to Him (διάκονος); they are not servants *of* the church (SCHENKEL). but only of Christ; *servants*, but *for* the church (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν), in doctrine (vers. 6, 7), in supplication to God (ver. 3), and in the varied intercourse with men, among whom they would advance their cause. They should never forget that they do not stand alone and for themselves, but in fellowship (ver. 7: σύνδουλος), that as colleagues they should esteem and love each other, that one should rejoice without envy in the other, as Paul in Epaphras, who meekly flies to

him, and should fraternally suffer with each other, as Epaphras with Paul. [Henry:—"Thus he puts an honor on an inferior minister, and teaches us not to be selfish, or think all that honor lost which goes beside ourselves. We learn in his example not to think it a disparagement to us, to *water* what others have *planted*, or build on the foundation others have *laid*."—"Observe Christ is our proper master and we His ministers. He does not say your minister, but the *minister of Christ for you.* It is by Christ's authority, but for the people's service."—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Even where we must fear and blame and warn, an opportunity for thanksgiving is not wanting. —In the general prayer for Sunday service belongs the petition for love toward *all* men; however easy towards *some*, it is just as difficult towards *all*.—Do not suffer a preacher, colleague or friend to be misunderstood and falsely judged, for speaking well of him belongs to obedience to the Ninth Commandment; neither break out blindly against him, that misunderstands the neighbor whose cause you would advance.—Rejoice when you see the word of God efficacious, and learn to wait patiently, as a husbandman for the fruits.

Starke:—He who does not believe on Jesus Christ, does not believe on God at all; so though the Jews and Turks think they believe on God, yet they in no wise do: for they do not believe on Jesus, on whom we must believe before we can assure ourselves of grace and salvation from God.—[Always to pray, and always to give thanks are the Christian's needful duties.—If teaching and learning are of the right sort, then God's word hath good speed.—Not all loving is praiseworthy; love in the Spirit is commended. —R.]

Rieger:—In the eyes of the world the character of a philanthropist, embracing all in his love, will indeed bring us more honor and glory than love to the saints; for this implies a distinction which the world does not willingly admit. The world has a love to which a Jew or Turk is more acceptable than a saint.—If we consider only the yet feeble beginnings of faith, the still prevailing temptations, we may doubt whether we have cause to rejoice and thank God. But by looking out to the mark of hope, which is set before us, the grace to us becomes very great.—It is certainly unspeakable how much the world, now so unbelieving and unthankful, does yet enjoy of the fruits of the gospel; how many arts and sciences, milder customs and laws would not exist, had not the gospel made the first advance in that direction.

Schleiermacher:—Faith, since it is active, becomes not only love to Christ, but also love to all, who belong to Christ.—We see how readily we allow ourselves to be led into all manner of divisions and limitations of love, which have less ground than then existed in the difference between Jewish and Gentile Christians. It is better to study such a love to *all* saints, and not one that extends to the few who exactly and specially agree with us, however great enjoyment there may be in it.—[The gospel is a germ, made fruitful by God, which cannot be received, without its making an impression on the spirit.—R.]

Passavant:—There is generally an unspeakably beneficent, tender feeling in giving thanks from the heart for a benefit.—Thanksgiving will be the bliss of eternity. The beginning, the first steps thereto must be made on the porch, else we shall have no voice nor place, no life above in the holy choirs.—It may often be long: days, years, decades may pass as we hear and know the gospel, before we obtain a living knowledge of the grace of God, that permeates our heart and mind and life.—"There are men," says Pascal, "who admire external greatness alone, as if there were no mental greatness; others can only admire mental greatness, as though there were not one infinitely higher, to be found in wisdom."

[Lisco:—The Apostolic thanksgiving and the praise therein contained has no other purpose than encouragement, 1) to continued steadfastness; 2) to further advance in all good.—Henry: —Ver. 3. In our thanksgiving we must have an eye to God as God (He is the object of thanksgiving as well as prayer), and as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom and through whom all good comes to us.—Vers. 4, 5. Faith, hope, and love, are the three principal graces in the Christian life, and proper matter of our prayer and thanksgiving.—We must love *all the saints*, bear an extensive kindness and good-will to good men, notwithstanding lesser points of difference and many real weaknesses.—Ver. 6. All who hear the word of the gospel, ought to bring forth the fruit of the gospel.—Wherever the gospel comes, it will bring forth fruit to the honor and glory of God. We mistake, if we think to monopolize the comforts and benefits of the gospel to ourselves.—Ver. 8. Faithful ministers are glad to be able to speak well of their people.—R.]

[Eadie:—Ver. 5. "For the hope." Every blessing which the gospel makes known has futurity in its eye,—and the Christian life, in the meantime, is one as much of expectation as of positive enjoyment.—Ver. 6. The gospel bore choice and noble clusters of fruit. It is not a ceremonial to be gazed at, or a congeries of opinions to be discussed. It is essentially a practical system, for its ethics are involved in its creed and worship.—The gospel was ecumenical, but the error which menaced them was only provincial in its sphere.—Ver. 8. Love is to be regarded as the crown and consequence of all the other graces. The Spirit of Him who is Love takes possession of the believing bosom, and exerts upon it His own assimilating power. A Christian community may be congratulated upon its love.—R.]

[Schenkel:—The true Christian idiosyncrasy of a church: 1) Its ground—faith in Christ; 2) its fruit—love to the saints; 3) its power—hope of the heavenly treasure of eternal life.—The gospel of Jesus Christ, the tree of life for humanity: 1) The fruit, which it brings; 2) the extension, which it gains.—The power of the gospel. 1) It consists in the word of the grace of God. 2) It is conditioned by a faithful proclamation and simple apprehension of it.—R.]

2. Earnest supplication for the progress of the Church in true knowledge, especially of the Being and Work of Christ.

(CHAPTER I. 9–23.)

9 For this cause we also, since the day we neard *it*, do not cease to pray for you,
and to desire[1] that ye might be filled with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom
10 and spiritual understanding [in all spiritual wisdom and understanding]: That ye[2]
might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work,
11 and increasing in [by][3] the knowledge of God; Strengthened with all might
[strength][4] according to his glorious power [the power of his glory],[5] unto all pa-
12 tience and longsuffering with joyfulness [joy];[6] Giving thanks unto the Father,
which [who] hath made us meet, to be partakers [for the portion, εἰς τὴν μερίδα][8] of the
13 inheritance of the saints in light: Who hath delivered us from [out of] the power
of darkness, and hath translated *us* into the kingdom of his dear Son [the Son of
14 his love];[9] In whom we have redemption through his blood [omit through his
15 blood],[10] *even* the forgiveness of sins: Who is the image of the invisible God, the
16 firstborn of [before] every creature: For [Because] by [in] him were all things cre-
ated, that are in heaven, and that are in [on] earth, visible and invisible, whether
they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created
17 by him, and for him: And he is[11] before all things, and by [ἐν, in] him all things
18 consist [subsist]. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the begin-
ning, the firstborn[12] from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-emi-
19 nence. For it pleased *the Father* that in him should all fulness dwell [Because in
20 him *God* was pleased that the whole fulness should dwell]:[13] And, having made
peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself:
21 by him, *I say*, whether *they be* things in [on] earth, or things in heaven. And
you, that were sometimes alienated and enemies in *your* mind by wicked works
22 [lit.: as to *your* understanding in wicked works], yet now hath he reconciled,[14] In
the body of his flesh through [his] death,[15] to present you holy and unblamable and un-
23 reprovable in his sight: If [If at least, εἴγε] ye continue in the faith grounded and
settled, and *be* not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard,
and which was preached to every creature[16] which is under heaven; whereof I Paul
am made a minister.[17]

[1] Ver. 9.—Καὶ αἰτούμενοι is wanting in B. [On the order of the latter part of the verse see EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[2] Ver. 10.—[Ὑμᾶς, inserted after περιπατῆσαι, Rec. Tischendorf, Wordsworth. Rejected by Lachmann, Meyer, Scholz, Alford, Ellicott, on the authority of ℵ. A. B. C. D. F. The subject "ye" necessarily supplied in the finite construction of our language.—R.]

[3] Ver. 10.—Instead of the more difficult reading: εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν, of D.[3] E.[2] K. L., we find in ℵ. B. [C. D. F. G.] τῇ ἐπιγνώσει, which with Meyer is to be regarded as an explanation. [Braune's German text: *in der Erkenntniss*, is certainly a typographical error for *in die Erkenntniss*. The reading ἐν with the dative has little support. Εἰς with the accusative, which Braune adopts, is that of Tischendorf (eds. 2 and 7, not 1). But Lachmann, Griesbach, Scholz, De Wette, Alford, Ellicott follow the preponderant uncial authority and read τῇ ἐπιγνώσει, all of them previous to the discovery of ℵ., which confirms this reading. I have therefore altered the English text to express the force of this reading (instrumental dative).—R.]

[4] Ver. 11.—["Strengthened with strength;" δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι.—R.]

[5] Ver. 11.—[The hendiadys of the E. V. is generally considered unfortunate. Coverdale, Rhemish: "the might of His glory."—R.]

[6] Ver. 11.—["Joy;" Wickliffe, Rhemish, Eadle, Alford, Ellicott.—R.]

[7] Ver. 12.—B. inserts καλέσαντι καί before ἱκανώσαντι [retained by Lachmann only.—R.]. D.[1] F. G. read καλέσαντι only, omitting ἱκαν. The first appears to have been interpolated, then the subsequent omission.

[8] Ver 12.—["For the portion," more literal than E. V., following the versions of Wickliffe, Coverdale and the Rhemish—"for the share," "for the part," *etc.*—R.]

[9] Ver. 13.—["Son of his love," preferred by all modern commentators, avoiding the hendiadys of the E. V.—R.]

[10] Ver. 14.—[Ellicott: "διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ rests only on cursive manuscripts, and is rightly omitted by nearly all modern editors." From Eph. I. 7.—R.]

[11] Ver. 17.—[Wordsworth reads ἔστι, "exists," instead of ἐστί, "is." "Subsist," Alford, Ellicott.—R.]

[12] Ver. 18.—Ἐκ is to be retained before τῶν νεκρῶν with B. and the corrector of ℵ.—B. alone has the article ἡ before ἀρχή.

[13] Ver. 19.—[The rendering of Alford, given above, coincides with that of Braune. See EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[14] Ver. 21.—B. and others have ἀποκατηλλάγητε. The reading ἀποκατήλλαξεν, ℵ. A. C. and others, seems to

be an emendation on account of the construction. [The preponderance of authority is on the other side. Lachmann adopts the reading of B., but Rec., E. V., Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth follow the mass of MSS. See Exeg. Notes.—R.]

[15] Ver. 22.—Αὐτοῦ after θανάτου, א. A., is properly omitted in B. [Τοῦ θανάτου is="his death" here.—R.]

[16] Ver. 23.—Τῇ is omitted after πάσῃ in א. A. B. C. and others. The corrector of א. adds it.

[17] Ver. 23.—Instead of διάκονος, the reading of א. B. [? A.] is κῆρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος, yet διάκονος is added in the margin of א.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The immediate object of supplication: full knowledge of the Divine will. (ver. 9.)—Ver. 9. **For this cause** refers to the entire paragraph, vers. 3–8. What the Apostle had heard of the Colossians moved him to the petition. This is required by the contents of the petition and by the accords: "since the day we heard" (ver. 9), to which the object must be supplied from above ("your faith in Christ Jesus and love to all the saints"); ver. 6. "since the day ye heard" and ver. 4. "since we heard:" and also "do not cease to pray for you" (ver. 9), and ver. 3, "praying also for you." After his thanks to God, Paul now gives the purport of his prayer. Certainly ver. 9 is not connected with ver. 8 alone, where the love of the Colossians to himself is spoken of: because he had heard this, he now prays for them (Bleek); as though Paul, like the Pharisees, prayed only for those who loved him.

We also, as in "we give thanks" (ver. 3), is Paul and those with him, hence not Timothy merely (Meyer, Schenkel), nor is he excluded (Baehr). Καί, "also," refers chiefly to Epaphras, who represents and labors for the Colossians (vers. 7–8), and then to the Colossians also, who were won to the gospel (ver. 6) and have love to the brethren (vers. 4. 8). It does not therefore indicate merely the reciprocity of intercourse between the Colossians and Paul (Schenkel, Meyer). [It has here its slightly *contrastive* force (Ellicott), and marks the change of subject; "we on our part" (Alford).—R.] It is not to be separated from ἡμεῖς and joined to διὰ τοῦτο (De Wette), nor by any means to προσευχόμενοι (Baumgarten-Crusius).

[**Since the day we heard.**—Ellicott: "incidental definition of the time with reference to ἀκούσαντες, ver. 4. Eadie: "The receipt of the intelligence produced immediate results and led to prayer. The effect was instant—and it was not spent with a single impulse." The prayer was continuous also.—R.]

Do not cease to pray for you, and to desire.—On οὐ παυόμεθα with the participles, see Eph. i. 16. [Ellicott: "an exactly similar affectionate hyperbole."—R.] The first verb denotes the wish (2 Cor. xiii. 9; 3 Jno. 2; Acts xxvii. 29), addressed to any one, then in general a prayer expressing a wish; the second, the supplication, entreaty, the medium with its reflection; *sibi expetere*, the pressing hearty petition from a sense of fellowship. [It seems a better distinction to regard the first as general, the second as special, "the one prayer in its ordinary aspect, the other direct request." Καί "brings into prominence a special after a general" (Alford). The comma of the E. V. answers the same purpose here.—R.]

That ye might be filled.—(Bengel: "He made mention of his supplications generally ver. 3; he now expresses what he supplicates." Ἵνα indicates the aim of the petition, the purpose of the petitioner, hence not simply its purport (against Harless, Eph. 17). [On ἵνα after verbs of praying, see Alford, 1 Cor. xiv. 13. "The *purport* and *purpose* become *compounded in the expression.*" Ellicott: "Ἵνα has here its secondary telic force, the subject of the prayer is blended with the purpose of making it."—R.] Πληρωθῆτε pre-supposes the imperfect state of those prayed for, and from its position at the beginning renders prominent the importance of progress to fulness. It occurs in this Epistle alone five times, here; ver. 25; ii. 10; iv. 12, 17; in Ephesians (i. 23; iii. 19; iv. 10; v. 18), and in Philippians (i. 11; ii. 2; iv. 18, 19), each four times.

With the knowledge of his will.—Τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν is an accusative of reference, like Phil. i. 11; so σκηνοποιὸς τὴν τέχνην (Acts xviii. 3). [Ellicott: "accusative of the remoter, the quantitative object in which the action of the verb has its realization." "The genitive marks the absolute *material* out of which the fulness was realized, the accusative as it were, the domain of which the fulness was evinced."—R.] See Winer's *Gram.* p. 216. Further it is not=τῇ ἐπιγνώσει, since they were not to be filled with the knowledge, but their knowledge should be full, perfect. The word itself describes the knowledge which grasps and penetrates the object (Meyer), as ver. 10; ii. 3; iii. 10. [Wordsworth: "ἐπίγνωσις, full knowledge is more than γνῶσις, it is a gift and grace of the Holy Spirit. This word occurs oftener in this Epistle than in any other of St. Paul. He may perhaps have used it as a contrast to the false γνῶσις or *gnosticism* of the false teachers, who were beguiling the Colossians with the speciousness of their vain philosophy. They in their theories promise γνῶσις, but the Apostle gave ἐπίγνωσις by his ministry." De Wette suggests, the former is a mere impractical and theoretical, the latter full and living knowledge.—R.] "Of his will," since it concerns the purpose of the prayer, is God's will, and, according to the context (ver. 10), the will of God respecting the walk and conversation of the Christian in the world. Hence not the redemptive decree, as Eph. i. 9 (Steiger and others), not the will of God which operates on us and is efficient in us, but the will of God to be obeyed by us, hence not the will of the majority (Schenkel). [The immediate context "in all wisdom," is against this limitation of "His will." The result of full knowledge was to be worthy walk, but the knowledge was not therefore to be limited to His will respecting walk. As a fact Christian walk is based on a far wider knowledge.—R.]

Paul now sets forth the mode in which this "being filled" was to be consummated: **In all spiritual wisdom and understanding.**—Hence this is not to be joined with "walk" (ver. 10), which is otherwise defined (Theodoret and

others). See Eph. i. 8: "in all wisdom and prudence." Σύνεσις is not identical with φρόνησις (Sirach. i. 4; σύνεσις φρονήσεως); the latter refers more to the God-given organ, the former more to the activity of man in using it; the latter more to the original gift, the former obtained rather by exercise. [The former is perhaps seen more in practically embracing a truth, the latter more in bringing the mind to bear upon it (ELLICOTT). — R.] The adjective "spiritual" belongs to both substantives. It indicates that the "being filled" cannot be effected by any purely natural development of human mental life from its own power. The wisdom is not "fleshly" (2 Cor i. 12; 1 Cor. i. 26), nor is the understanding of this character; yet neither are of themselves spiritual," they become so only through the Holy Ghost. [EADIE and ALFORD join πνευματικῇ to συνέσει alone, but it seems better with ELLICOTT to join both adjectives to both substantives. On σοφία and σύνεσις, the general and particular, ELLICOTT remarks: "both appear to have a practical reference; the former is, however, a general term; the latter its more special result and application."—R.]

The aim of the petition: Christian walk. Vers. 10–12. They were not to rest with "knowledge of His will," but advance.

Ver. 10. **That ye might walk.**—The infinitive, περιπατῆσαι, depending on πληρωθῆτε is epexegetical (WINER'S *Gram.* pp. 298, 301); it is not necessary to supply εἰς or ὥστε. The closer definition follows.—**Worthy of the Lord** refers to Christ [as always *apparently* in St. Paul's Epistles (ELLICOTT).—R.], the model of the Christian. Neither 1 Thess. ii. 12, "worthy of God," nor Eph. iv. 1, "followers of God," will justify us in understanding it otherwise.—**Unto all pleasing** describes the manner of the worthy walk, giving prominence to the purpose (εἰς). Ἀρέσκεια, only here, in a good sense, describes in classical authors the conduct of the ἄρεσκος, the obsequious, *i. e.*, obsequiousness. The context requires that it be understood as "pleasing Christ" not God, in spite of Matt. v. 48 (SCHENKEL). Since Christ can be pleased in everything, "all" is added.

This is confirmed by the following characteristic of the Christian walk: **Being fruitful in every work.**—[Braune reads, "being fruitful and increasing in every good work," a collocation in conformity with his view of the text and his exegesis. The order of the E. V. seems to preserve the symmetry and present the meaning better.—R.] On the nominatives καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὐξ., instead of the more exact accusatives, to agree with ὑμᾶς implied after περιπατῆσαι, see Eph. iv. 1, 3. Here it is readily explained, yet not by joining the participles to πληρωθῆτε (BENGEL); the two participles are united as in ver. 6; first bearing fruit, then growing more, as in a tree, in order to greater fruitfulness. The sphere of both is denoted by "in." The prepositional phrase, standing first for emphasis, is not to be joined with "pleasing" (OECUMEN, STEIGER and others), but with the verbs [or according to the view of ALFORD, ELLICOTT and others, with the verb "being fruitful"—undoubtedly to be preferred if the instrumental dative is retained. See below.—R.] By "good works" we are to understand, works required by the will of God, growing out of faith, demanded, not merely by law, but by relations, circumstances, by the inward impulse of the conscience and the Holy Ghost.

[**And increasing by the knowledge of God.**] The advance is made into, up to the knowledge of God. This indeed depends upon their being "filled with the knowledge of His will" (ver. 9). Their being fruitful and increasing in every good work aids thereto. Hence LUTHER is incorrect; and be fruitful in every good work and increase in the knowledge of God. [The order of the E. V. is the same.—R.] Advance is made from knowledge to knowledge in the Christian walk, wherein the spirit of God guides into all truth (Jno. xvi. 13; xiv. 26). Εἰς is neither = κατά (BÖHMER nor = ἐν (BEZA), nor = the dative which HUTHER and others read. [The close union of the two participles above and the preceding exegetical note are based on the less supported reading: εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν. The better reading is τῇ ἐπιγνώσει (instrumental dative). This is to be joined with αὐξανόμενοι, "increasing by the knowledge of God." As the main reason for retaining the reading of the fewer MSS. is that it is more difficult, ALFORD remarks, supporting τῇ ἐπιγνώσει: "this is by far the most difficult of the three readings, the meaning of ἐν and εἰς being very obvious, the former pointing out the element, the latter the proposed measure of the increase. And hence, probably, the variations. It is the knowledge of God which is the real instrument of *enlargement*, in soul and life, of the believer—not a γνῶσις which φυσιοῖ, but an ἐπίγνωσις which αὐξάνει." So OLSHAUSEN, DE WETTE, HUTHER, EADIE, ELLICOTT.—R.]

Ver. 11 gives a second definition of the walk, almost exactly like the first in its construction. —**Strengthened with all strength,** ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι. The verb, which occurs only here, marks those walking worthy of the Lord as energized in activity, not in one direction, but in all: in will, affection and perception, in understanding, in home and calling, in all external relations. [Braune seems to regard ἐν as indicating the element, and δύναμις as subjective (so ALFORD). It seems more natural and accordant with the phrase immediately following, to take ἐν as instrumental and δύναμις as objective, *i. e.*, strength from God. So MEYER, EADIE, ELLICOTT (THEODORET is quoted by the latter), and E. V.; in either case "all" implies that the energy extends to every department.—R.] The paranomasia, as well as the construction like that of the previous clause, forbid the separation of the prepositional phrase from the verb, to join it with what precedes.

According to the power of His glory, κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης.—Power is requisite, the Christian does not have it in himself; the measure of it is not inconsiderable, it increases. God alone gives it in proportion to the Power which He has, in comparison with whose glory, majesty, grace and mercy, we are and have nothing. His glory ever reveals itself more and more to him who walks worthy of the Lord. The motive and measure of our strength is in

the might of the majesty of God, whom we know ever better. Hence δόξα and ἰσχύς (Eph. i. 19; vi. 10, "according to the power of his might") are not to be considered as parallels and the former limited here to the Ruler's dignity (STEIGER), nor is the phrase="glorious power" (LUTHER, BAEHR, [E. V.], and others), as though it were ἔνδοξον κράτος.

Unto all patience and long-suffering with joy.—Through growing strength progress is made in directions the most various (πάσαν, all) "unto patience" (ὑπομονήν) which is not merely suffering (ὑπέχει, Jude. 7. only) *i. e., sustinere.* Ὑπομένειν means the mind in suffering; ὑπομονή denotes this constancy and patience of the mind. Hence we find, not the patience of God, but "the God of patience" spoken of (Rom. xv. 5), it is not God, who demands, but who dispenses "patience" (TITTMANN, *Syn.*, I. p. 194). "Patience" is opposed to displeasure without power to help or change; "long-suffering," to displeasure with power to punish, to avenge, to alter and avert. CHRYSOSTOM: "one is long-suffering towards those whom it is possible to requite, but patient towards those whom he is unable to requite." In the former case the objects are usually men, in the latter, circumstances. It is incorrect to make "patience" refer to the extent, and "long suffering" to the continuance of the feeling (SCHENKEL), or to contrast timidity with the former and irritability with the latter (HUTHER), or to ignore the distinction (MEYER, BLEEK). [ELLICOTT renders εἰς, "to insure, to lead you into," marking the final destination; EADIE: "in order to." See his notes *in loco*, on the distinction between "patience" and "long suffering."—R.] That which is characteristically Christian in both is: "with joy," which is impossible in such a case without the power of God. In "patience and long-suffering" the Christian is glad, and certain of the victory of his cause, of his reward with God both in his own heart and in heaven. It must not then be joined with "giving thanks" (ver. 12), as is done by the Greek fathers, ESTIUS, HUTHER, MEYER, SCHENKEL, BLEEK. [And also by TISCHENDORF, LACHMANN, ELLICOTT, on the ground of the parallelism in the structure of the clauses.—R.] "With joy" would be entirely superfluous in that connection; the parallelism is not compulsory, and besides it is not "*in* joy," indicating the element, but "with (μετά), which shows that it is only an accompaniment with "patience." [As DE WETTE says: by such a connection "we lose the essential idea of joyful endurance—and the beautiful train of thought, that joyfulness in suffering expresses itself in thankfulness to God" (ALFORD). —R.]

The *third definition* follows (vers. 12–14).—Ver. 12.—**Giving thanks to the Father who hath made us meet.**—Even in sorrow, let there be thanksgiving; let not Him be forgotten who giveth gifts and is the Father. It is incorrect, to take the participle, not as coördinate with "being fruitful," "increasing," "strengthened," but as connected with "do not cease," ver. 9 (Greek fathers, CALVIN, BENGEL); or to supply "of our Lord Jesus Christ" (ver. 3) after "Father" (MEYER) [ALFORD, ELLICOTT.—R.], instead of regarding Him, in accordance with the context, as our Father, who however is and proves Himself such in Christ: *qui idoneos fecit, fueramus enim inidonei*, 2 Cor. iii. 6 (BENGEL). "Us" includes the Apostle and his companions and his readers, who are Christians.—For what has He made us meet?—**For the portion of the inheritance of the saints in light.**—"For" (εἰς as above) marks the aim the "making meet," which (as aorist) shows that it is already, even though incipiently, attained. Τὴν μερίδα describes the "portion," share, which falls to one personally (Luke x. 42; xii. 43), and "the inheritance" (τοῦ κλήρου) describes the whole of which the Christian is partaker, as given *sorte non pretio* (BENGEL), as undeserved. The expression is borrowed from the Old Testament (Ps. xvi. 5, "the portion of my inheritance, μερὶς τῆς κληρονομίας); as the chosen people obtained Canaan (ἡ γῆ τῆς κληρονομίας) through the grace of God, and each Israelite his part in the distribution of the land, so the Christian obtains his portion in and of the kingdom of heaven. "The saints" then describes the possessors of the heritage. The position of ἐν φωτί forbids our connecting it with ἱκανώσαντι, "making meet" (Greek fathers, STEIGER, MEYER), which besides is accomplished in another way than "in light;" or with "inheritance" (BEZA, HUTHER, BLEEK), or with "portion" (BENGEL). It is a closer description of the sphere in which "the saints," the Christians, (ver. 2) are found in their walk (ver. 10), in order to mark the extent of the benefit conferred upon them through the "making meet," which is the occasion of the thanksgiving. Comp. Eph. v. 8, 9, 11; iv. 18. According to the context the result is the principal point here, not the means, which are introduced afterwards, but without any exposition of "in light" or any reference to it. Hence it is incorrect, to contrast with Christians as the "saints in light" other saints in darkness, under the law in the Old Testament, which is contrary to the *usus loquendi* and to Pauline views (GROTIUS: thus is shown the distinction of the law and the gospel), or to refer it to future glory (SCHENKEL:= ἐν τῇ δόξῃ). [This last view is the popular one; "light is taken to mean "heaven," and the passage interpreted as a thanksgiving for what God has done to prepare us for an inheritance in heaven, or inheritance with the saints in heaven. Obviously this is forbidden by the context. EADIE, who joins it with "inheritance" as descriptive of it, ALFORD, who connects it with the whole phrase "portion - - saints," and ELLICOTT, who indicates a preference for joining it with "inheritance of the saints," all avoid this mistake. The saints are now "in light," and the inheritance *is* "in light." "In light" as the sphere of their walk, the saints enjoy their "inheritance" which is "begun here and the meetness conferred in gradual sanctification, but completed hereafter."—R.]

God's act and gift, as the foundation and beginning of the Christian walk, more accurately defined (vers. 13, 14).

Ver. 13. **Who hath delivered us out of the power of darkness.**—"Who" refers back to "Father." His act is first, "hath delivered

us," *i. e.*, has drawn, snatched us out of danger (see PASSOW, *Lex.*). CHRYSOSTOM: "He does not say delivered, but snatched (ἐῤῥύσατο), showing our and their great misery and captivity." ZANCHIUS: "This is more than: he has liberated. For those are liberated, who are willing and desirous and deserving of being made free; those who are seized are often unwilling, as Lot from Sodom; he magnifies both the grace and the power of God." "Out of the power of darkness" denotes the power under the dominion of which Christians were before Redemption. The first substantive describes the organized power, the second its character, as Eph. ii. 2: "the power of the air;" vi. 12: "powers of this darkness." [ALFORD: "power *i. e.*, in the territorial sense; darkness—not to be understood of a person but of the character of the region." ELLICOTT: "evil and sin viewed objectively." DAVIES refers here to the dualism of the Zend-avesta.—R.] Necessarily opposed to this is "the power of His glory" (ver. 11), and as a consequence "the saints" are "in light." Here we find a justification of the exposition given above.

And translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love.—But He did not stop with this "deliverance" (*καί*); He has "translated" (*μετέστησεν*) us. The word denotes a local change, hence a change of relation, determining the conduct and walk. "Into the kingdom" is in contrast with "out of the power," and "the Son of His love" with "darkness." "The Son of His love," which recalls both in phrase and connection Eph. i. 6, occurs only here, and sets forth the Son with the greatest emphasis as the Object of His love, upon whom His entire love flows, and through Him therefore upon us. The Son is not conceived of here as "out of" the love, born out of its substance (AUGUSTINE), [*i. e.*, "Love considered more as an essence than an attribute."—R.]; nor is it=His beloved Son (Matt. iii. 17; xvii. 25; xii. 18). [Nor "His dear Son" (E. V).—R.] Not only is the "power" His, but the "kingdom" also, the Messianic kingdom of heaven, which is already actually present here, but not completed in the Christian Church, and therefore not identical with it. This is not then to be understood of the church (BAEHR, HUTHER and others). ["The term has a reference neither purely metaphorical (the church), nor ethical and inward, nor yet ideal and proleptic (MEYER), but —semi-local and descriptive —nor is this wholly future" (ELLICOTT).—R.]

Ver. 14 gives the *modus translationis* (THOMAS AQUINAS): **In whom we have redemption, even the forgiveness of sins.**—Like Eph. i. 7, except that "through his blood" is omitted here [retained in Rec. and E. V.—R.], the means of redemption not being made prominent; and that *ἁμαρτιῶν* is deeper and more internal than *παραπτωμάτων*. Paul's freedom and independence are unmistakable. [The exact force is: "In whom we are having the redemption" (ELLICOTT).—R.] Such a possession is the result of the act of God which changes our relation to Him [through the Redeemer whom the Apostle then describes.—R.]

The exalted relation of the Mediator to God and the world. Vers. 15–17. BENGEL: "He describes the glory and eminence of Christ above the highest angels; and scatters those germs from which he afterwards confutes the worshippers of angels. This so full knowledge of Christ is comprehended only by those who are experienced in the mystery of redemption."

Ver. 15. **Who is.**—"Is," not "was" or "became;" hence we have here defined, not what He became at His appearing in the flesh, but what He *is*, and is personally (*τοῦ υἱοῦ—ὅς*). [Undoubtedly the subject of the whole passage is "the Son of God's love" (ver. 13); and this subject must be taken in its widest and most complex relations, whether as Creator or Redeemer, the immediate context defining the precise nature of the reference (ELLICOTT). MEYER very justly remarks: "It must be noted that Paul is viewing Christ according to His present Being, *i. e.*, according to His present and permanent status of exaltation, and hence he expresses not what Christ was, but what He is." Yet it cannot be denied that while this is true, there must be a distinction made in referring the various predicates to the subject, for even MEYER in objecting to this says: "The only correct reference is to His whole Person, which in the theanthropic status of his present heavenly Being *is* continuously what His Divine nature (considered in itself) *was* before the Incarnation, so that by virtue of the identity of His Divine Nature, we can attribute the same predicates to the Exalted One as to the Logos." He thus himself implies a distinction, which he will not permit in Paul's language. In claiming as we do with the Fathers generally, BENGEL, ELLICOTT, BLEEK, WORDSWORTH and many others, that the immediate reference throughout this verse is to the *λόγος ἄσαρκος* (against MELANCHTHON, BARNES, EADIE, and ALFORD, who refer it to the *λόγος ἔνσαρκος*), we by no means deny that all which is here predicated is, now and forever, true of the Son of God's love, but guard against a false interpretation of the predicates themselves. Admitting that such a distinction can be made, we find a reason for the above reference in the fact that ver. 16, which gives a reason for the statements of this verse, must be referred to the Logos, or to the whole Person of Christ, "by virtue of the identity of His Divine Nature." The grammatical connection with ver. 14, which refers to the *λόγος ἔνσαρκος* is not so close. The subject then in this verse is the Son of God's love, as He was before the incarnation, and as He still "is."—R.]

The image of the invisible God, *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀοράτου* (2 Cor. iv. 4). The first thing is His relation to God, immanent and permanent. *Εἰκών* is not in itself something visible (PHILO: *θεοῦ λόγον εἰκόνα λέγει θεοῦ*). Comp Gen. i. 26, 27. God's image in man is not that which is perceptible by the sense, only thus cognizable. Compare the expression with *μορφὴ θεοῦ, ἴσα θεῷ* (Phil. ii. 6), and *ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ* (Heb. i. 3). It denotes likeness to and equality with the invisible God (Jno. i. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 18), who cannot be perceived absolutely without a Mediator and a revelation, hence is invisible to angels and the redeemed (Heb. xii. 14). The context here differs entirely from Jno. i. 14. Here we must think of the Exalted One, transported from

our sight, who yet already existed before the creation. Thus the "Son of His love" is further described (THEOPHYLACT: μόνος—καὶ ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκών). The revelation, the making known, the rendering visible of the Father is put in the second place. It is not to be viewed as the chief point here, nor as the sole ground of this expression (Jno. xiv. 9), as CALVIN, SCHENKEL and others prefer; nor is it to be entirely denied (BAEHR, HUTHER). [It is worthy of note that here, as in all the terms used in the Scriptures to express His relation to the Father, there seems to be an implication of revelation (*λόγος, ἀπαύγασμα χαρακτήρ, μορφή*, and even in *πρωτότοκος π. κτ.*) On this relation, immanent and permanent, the actual revelation in the Person of Jesus Christ, indeed the context implies, in all other ways, seems to rest. Still we must be careful not to limit the meaning to this actual revelation as EADIE, BARNES and others do, for as Braune remarks:—R.] it is a sad dilution to interpret: God has as it were made Himself visible in Him (DE WETTE), in Christ it is manifest that God is wise, powerful, good and the like (GROTIUS).

The first-born before every creature, *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*.—[So Ellicott. Braune's exegesis is better set forth by: the first begotten before every creature. — R.] This second predicate defines His relation to the created world. Πρωτότοκος distinguishes Him as the Son *from* the creation (*κτίσις*); it is = *πρωτόγονος*, "first begotten" (PHILO), but not = *πρωτόκτιστος, πρωτόπλαστος* (among the Alexandrians, ORIGEN). It is joined with the first predicate, closely uniting *with* God and distinguishing *from* the creation. (THEODORET: "not as having creation for a sister, but as begotten before all creation." CHRYSOSTOM: "not significant of glory and honor, but only of time.") It is synonymous with *ἀρχή* (ver. 18; Rev. iii. 4). The genitive *κτίσεως* depends on *πρῶτος* as *πρῶτός μου*, Jno. i. 15, 30 (WINER'S *Gram.* p. 229). [So MEYER. It must be here remarked that WINER does not expressly sanction this view of this passage. It would not perhaps be strictly correct to say that the genitive is governed by *πρῶτος* in composition, although the Greek syntax favors such government in composition. BENGEL even governs this genitive by the *πρό* found in *πρῶτος*. ELLICOTT's view is a safe one: "genitive of the *point of view*, rendered more intelligible by the latent comparative force involved in *πρῶτος*," though even this is but a circumlocutory statement of its dependence on *πρῶτος*. As the word is Alexandrian, the syntax has been supported by Hebrew usage, though the broad use of the Greek genitive scarcely requires this.—R.]

Since *πάσης* denotes every kind of creature, angels and men, Christ existed before all. He does not begin the series of a category, as "first begotten of the dead" (Rev. i. 15), "among many brethren" (Rom. viii. 29), but He is antecedent, conditioning the creation. [It is doubtful, whether it is better to take *πάσης κτίσεως*, collectively: "the whole creation," or individually: "every creature," the context favors the former, so ALFORD; the polemic aim of the Apostle, the latter, so ELLICOTT.—Braune makes this predicate refer exclusively to priority in time. On this ELLICOTT speaks of "His deigning by the mouth of His Apostle to institute a *temporal* comparison between His own generation from eternity and their creation in time," but he admits "the possibility of "a secondary and *inferential* reference to priority in dignity." ALFORD seems to include both views; "not only first-born of His mother in the world, but first-begotten of His Father before the worlds — He holds the rank, as compared with every created thing, of first-born in dignity." To the view which makes the latter thought the chief one, as held by WHITBY, BARNES, EADIE ("the acting President of the Universe and therefore the first-born of every creature"), it may be objected; 1. that it confuses the aspects in which this verse refers to the Son of God's love, see above; 2. it gives to *πρωτότοκος* a secondary and figurative meaning, where a more literal one seems more appropriate; 3. it ignores, or at least throws too far into the back-ground, the relation to the Father which is not only expressed in *πρωτότοκος*, but given further prominence by the close connection with the preceding clause; hence those who adopt it consistently refer that predicate also mainly to the revelation of the Father in Christ, rather than to the relation of the Son to the Father. Yet it must be admitted that there is an inferential reference to priority in dignity, a consequence of the priority in time of the Begotten to every creature; not only so, but as Braune well remarks: He **is** antecedent, conditioning the creation—for the context, giving a reason (*ὅτι*) for this verse, goes on to set forth in detail His relation to the creation. So that while His priority in time shows His independence of creation, creation is not independent of Him, as He is here described. In this His relation to the Invisible God is to be found the ground or condition of the whole creation. The 16th verse asserts that He is the *causa conditionalis*, this one seems to intimate that in virtue of His relation immanent and permanent to the Father, as the Image and Only Begotten, He holds the relation to the creation subsequently defined. So WORDSWORTH quotes Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch: "when God desired to create the world, He begat the world as *προφορικὸν, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*." While He is thus placed out of the category of the created, He is the more intimately linked with "every creature."—R.]

Therefore the view of the Arians that He is the first creature is incorrect, as also that of the Socinians, GROTIUS and others, who refer *κτίσεως* to the new moral creation, in which case *καινή* would not be wanting (2 Cor. v. 17). To make of the two predicates but one and join *πρωτότοκος* as an adjective to *εἰκών* (SCHLEIERMACHER, *Stud. und Krit.* 1832, p. 497) is not only harsh, but grammatically inadmissible. To read *πρωτοτόκος*, "first bringer forth" (ISIDORE of Pelusium, ERASMUS and others), is not allowable, since this is applied only to the female sex, and *πρῶτος* in that case would be irrelevant.

Ver. 16. **Because in him were all things created.**—This verse justifies the explanation given above. Ὅτι adds the reason that *ante omnem creaturam genitum esse filium, non creatum*, before every creature the Son was begotten, not created: "in Him were all things created." The emphasis is placed upon "in Him." The verb

requires us to understand the fact of creation as here spoken of; the historical act, as the aorist denotes. Acts x. 6 has ἔκτισε τὸν οὐρανόν κ. τ. λ., while xiv. 7, reads: τῷ ποιήσαντι τὸν ουρανόν. The same interchange occurs Gen. vi. 7; Deut. iv. 22, Sirach xv. 14; xxiv. 9 [LXX]. SCHLEIERMACHER should not therefore affirm that κτίζειν is not used in Hellenistic Greek of the original creation, but means to give order, arrangement. This creation is ἐ ν α ὐ τ ῷ, not ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, which would indicate the first cause. This is not the Son, but the Father, as the thought in the word is efficient in the Son, out from whom the creation is accomplished; but there is no thought of emanation, hence ἐξ αὐτοῦ is not used. It is here indicated that the accomplishment of the creation rests in Him, its immediate instrumental cause is to be sought in Him, but not the last, *principalis*. 'Ἐν αὐτῷ is not to be referred to the κόσμος νοητός, the *idea omnium rerum*, which was in Him (SCHLEIERMACHER and others), nor is it = δι' αὐτοῦ (USTERI); nor does ἐ κ τ ί σ θ η refer to the new moral creation, which reference is not supported by Eph. iv. 23, where the context is entirely different. ['Ἐν αὐτῷ here denotes, not the *causa instrumentalis* nor *causa exemplaris*, but *causa conditionalis*, as the conditional element pre-existent and all-including. ALFORD, ELLICOTT. —R.] Τ ὰ π ά ν τ α is the existing all, the totality of things [the universe, ALFORD.—R.], πάντα would be all that actually is (WINER's *Gram.* p. 105). A specification as regards *place* follows: **in heaven and that are on earth**, τ α ἐ ν τ ο ῖ ς ο ὐ ρ α ν ο ῖ ς κ α ὶ τ ὰ ἐ π ὶ τ ῆ ς γ ῆ ς.—Thus Paul writes instead of *οἱ οὐρανοί* or *ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ*, not excluding these however, because to him all depends upon this, that nothing was created without Him; He stands in such a relation to the whole creation that He was before it and it exists first through Him. There is no reason for understanding by this, *habitatores qui reconciliantur* (WETTSTEIN), or only living creatures (BAEHR) or rational creatures. On τοῖς οὐρανοῖς see Eph. i. 10. We cannot conclude from the precedence of *οἱ οὐρανοί* that emphasis is placed upon the creation of angels (THEOPHYLACT), nor from the omission of "under the earth," that God has not created for the lower world (*Unterwelt*); the context gives no warrant for this.—**Visible and invisible.**—This is added to describe the *nature* of what was created. There is no reason for referring both exclusively either to earthly (SCHLEIERMACHER), or to heavenly things (THEODORET); nor are the former alone visible, and the latter invisible, since among the visible we must reckon sun, moon and stars, and among the invisible human souls. The Apostle places the highest, "things in heaven," first, but here the more important follows, because he intends to give a specification of the angels. It must be borne in mind that τὰ πάντα is described. Hence "invisible" does not refer merely to the heavenly world of spirits (MEYER), though this is the main reference (BLEEK).—**Whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers,** εἴ τ ε θ ρ ό ν ο ι, εἴ τ ε κ υ ρ ι ό τ η τ ε ς, εἴ τ ε α ρ χ α ὶ, εἴ τ ε ἐ ξ ο υ σ ί α ι. Εἴ τ ε, thus repeated, specifies the world of angels, to which we arrive through "invisible;" at the same time it indicates an uncertainty respecting the classes of angels, or that nothing essential depends upon this classification. In Eph. i. 21, we find ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, δύναμις, κυριότης; δύναμις is not found here, nor θρόνος there. This latter word occurs here only in the New Testament, but is applied by the Rabbins, by Dionysius the Areopagite and *testamentum* Levi, to the angels in the seventh or highest heaven. These classes may be regarded as different orders, joined in pairs; θρόνοι, the highest, κυριότητες, the lowest, ἀρχαί and ἐξουσίαι, the intermediate. [ELLICOTT, comparing Eph. i. 21, "where the order *seems* descensive," says, "we may *possibly* infer that the θρόνοι are the highest order, *etc.*, if indeed all such distinctions are not to be deemed precarious and presumptuous. It may have been suggested by some known theosophistic speculations of the Colossians, but more probably was an incidental revelation, which the term ἀόρατα evoked." PEARSON thus gives the intent of the passage and the force of εἴτε: "Lest in that invisible world, among the many degrees of the celestial hierarchy, any order might seem excepted from an essential dependence upon Him, he nameth those which are of greatest eminence, and in them comprehendeth the rest."—R.] SCHLEIERMACHER most incorrectly applies ἀόρατα to earthly empires, civil orders and legal conditions (MELANCHTHON similarly), and understands here magisterial offices and other functions of persons in power.

All things were created by him and for him, τὰ πάντα δ ι' α ὐ τ ο ῦ κ α ὶ ε ἰ ς α ὐ τ ὸ ν ἔ κ τ ι σ τ α ι. [Literally, all things have been created through Him and to Him.—R.] Solemn recapitulation (MEYER). The perfect, setting the past in relation to the present, is chosen instead of the aorist, noting the *factum*, because we have here a dogmatic consideration of the completed and now existing creation (WINER's *Gram.* p. 255). Hence also we have not merely δι' αὐτοῦ (instrumental), but ε ἰ ς α ὐ τ ό ν, indicating Him as the τέλος of creation. BENGEL: *ἐν denotat prius quiddam quam mox διά et εἰς. Notatur initium, progressus, finis.* Comp. Rom. xi. 36; 1 Cor. viii. 6, where εἰς αὐτόν refers to God, as here to Christ, to whom the κυριότης τῶν πάντων is committed (Matt. xxviii. 18; Phil. ii. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 27), who is the delegated Regent of the world (MEYER). Εἰς denotes not simply *for* Him, but also *to* Him, in Him (WINER's *Gram.* p. 390). That He is Lord over all is but one side therefore; the other is, that to Him the whole is directed, and thus is developed, exalted, glorified. To His exalted dignity is joined the glorifying of what is created, the participation of the creatures in His glory and blessedness. [ELLICOTT: *ἐν αυτῷ, causa conditionalis; δι' αὐτοῦ, causa medians; εἰς αὐτόν, causa finalis* or *finis ultimus.* ALFORD: "He is the end of creation, containing the reason in Himself, why creation is at all and why it is as it is."—R.]

Ver. 17 accordingly adds: **And he is before all things.**—Α ὐ τ ό ς and ἐ σ τ ι are emphatic from their position. ["He Himself is" or "exists." —R.] Both the permanence of the existence of Christ and His pre-existence are affirmed. The *usus loquendi* requires only, that it be understood of *time*, the context, of the *whole;* compare Jno. viii. 58. The Vulgate is incorrect: *ante omnes*, and Luther, *vor Allen*, [*i. e.*, before all beings.—

R.] So also the Socinians, SCHLEIERMACHER and others, who limit the meaning to superior rank, which is indeed sufficiently implied in such an assertion of priority.—**And in him all things subsist.**—[The E. V. here as in ver. 15, unfortunately renders ἐν, "by."—R.] The verb is used of things held together, as milk, which runs. So 2 Pet. iii. 5; γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγῳ. Without Christ all things would fall asunder. The perfect, following ἐστι, has the force of the present—put together and now subsisting. The reference is to organic permanence, the continuance of the composition of the things of the world "in Him," because He holds together what He has created. [ELLICOTT: "the causal sphere of their continuing existence,—not *exactly* identical with ἐν αὐτῷ above. Christ was the conditional element of their *creation*, the causal element of their persistence."—R.] It does not refer to a consolidation of earthly relations (SCHLEIERMACHER), nor to the acknowledgment and rule of the Lord in the new world (BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS).

The relation of the Mediator to the Church. Vers. 18–20.

Ver. 18. **And he is the head of the body, the church.**—"And He," αὐτός, [is emphatic, possibly involving an antithesis to some errors of the Colossian Church (ALFORD, ELLICOTT). The subject is "the Son of God's love," the passage requiring a reference to the λόγος ἔνσαρκος, the now glorified Christ.—R.] "Is": in form this is a resumption of ver. 17, connected closely with that verse, but in matter it refers back to the starting-point, ver. 14, so that, just as in vers. 15, 16, the corresponding relative clause (ὅς ἐστιν) follows, together with its proof (ὅτι). The parallel of thought—Christ, the Son of God, is before and over the world, as He is Head of the Church—is echoed in the chain of parallel clauses. On "the Head of the Body, the Church," see Eph. i. 22, 23. The second genitive is unquestionably *appositional* (WINER's *Gram.*, p. 494, and Eph. iv. 9). In the parallel passage: "Head over all things," *etc.*—the relation of Christ to the world is defined by "over all things." On the Church as an organism, a Body, see Eph. iv. 12; v. 23, 30; that the world might not be considered this Body, "the Church" is added. It does not refer to the family of God in heaven and on earth (RÖSSELT); this is too spiritualistic, is contrary to biblical realism and *usus loquendi*.

Who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, ὅς ἐστι ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν.—"First-born," πρωτότοκος, here is somewhat different from ver. 15,—in the more exact sense of one beginning a series. Hence ἐκ can be omitted, as in Rev. i. 5. The preposition marks the fact, conceived of as in Eph. v. 14: "arise from (ἐκ) the dead;" as ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν also occurs, to denote the separation of the living from the dead. The reference is not to those merely who have died within the church (SCHENKEL); for when the dead revived in the Old Testament times, they were not "first-born from the dead," since they died again; it is otherwise in the case of Christ. [ELLICOTT distinguishes this passage from Rev. i. 5, where the preposition is omitted: "first-born not only of, but out of the dead"—He left their realm and came again as with a new begetting and new birth into life."—R.] It is pre-supposed, but not stated either in the text or context: "because He restores life to others" (CALVIN. THEODORET: "the phrase hints also at the resurrection of us all"). [EADIE retaining his view of πρωτότοκος, as referring to priority in dignity, remarks: "as He rose from the midst of the dead, He became their chief,—came out from among them as their representative. His people rise in virtue of His power. He is not only the pledge, He is also the pattern." This is undoubtedly true, but only implied here.—R.] By "first-born," which was not chosen without a reference to ver. 15, ἀρχή, a word of wide signification, is here more closely defined as "the Beginning," while the personality is at the same time thus emphasized as the principal thing. Comp. Jno. xi. 25. So Gen. xlix. 3: "Reuben my first-born" (ἀρχὴ τέκνων μου=πρωτότοκός μου, Deut. xxi. 17). It is therefore="the first-fruits of them that slept" (ἀρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, 1 Cor. xv. 20), "first that should rise from the dead" (πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Acts xxvi. 23); hence to be taken as referring to time, with a secondary reference, however, to a power efficient in a succeeding series (Rev. iii. 14; xxii. 13); in which it differs from ἀπαρχή. Hence it is neither *principium* (BAEHR, STEIGER, HUTHER), nor Regent of the world (FLATT), nor author of the Church (BAUMGARTEN CRUSIUS), nor "beginning of the second and new creation" (CALVIN). Nor is "of the resurrection" to be supplied (DE WETTE), since the Apostle had far more in view than "the dead," nor "of the church" (SCHENKEL), since there is nothing to indicate this; nor is "first-born" an adjective joined to "beginning" (SCHLEIERMACHER). [While ἀρχή has here a primary temporal reference, and is further defined as a Personality by πρωτότοκος, there is an argumentative force in the relative "who" involving a secondary reference to "the church" which immediately precedes. So ELLICOTT, EADIE, who insists upon this too exclusively, however. ALFORD: "He is the 'beginning,' in that in Him is begun and conditioned the church." WORDSWORTH suggests the two-fold sense of ἀρχή; 1. *principium*, beginning. 2. *principalitas*, dominion, rule. In the first sense, Christ is the source of life to the church: in the second, the Principality of all things, therefore even in His manhood superior to the angelic principalities and powers (against the false teachers).—R.]

That in all things he might have the pre-eminence.—["In order that (ἵνα) in all things he (αὐτός, emphatic,) might become (γένηται) pre-eminent."—R.] Ἵνα denotes the purpose of God working herein; it is not=ὥστε (ESTIUS, BAEHR). What He is, is the basis for something else, which is accomplished in the purpose—which becomes (γένηται); hence such permanent relations are here concerned, as took shape historically, and are adapted for definite ends, to be realized in time (STEIGER). In that He is the Risen One, it is the design of God, that He becomes ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων, *He*, emphatically, and none other, *sine locum tenentibus*, *sine vicario* (BENGEL), and "in all," on all sides, in wisdom, holiness, might, death-overcoming power, dominion and glory, as respects the world as well as the church. The *First*, for ever and

for every one. The verb πρωτεύω occurs only here in the New Testament and denotes strongly, "to have the first rank." [ALFORD: "The word is a transitional one, from priority in time to priority in dignity, and shows incontestibly that the two ideas have been before the Apostle's mind throughout," though, as ELLICOTT suggests, this being a result, the same meaning does not necessarily belong to πρωτότοκος.—R.] 'Εν πᾶσιν must be neuter, as Tit. ii. 9, 10; 1 Tim. iii. 11; iv. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 7; iv. 5; Hebrews xiii. 4, 18,=παντί (1 Cor. i. 5; 2 Cor. iv. 8, etc). Did it refer to νεκρῶν, it must have the article. Hence *inter omnes* (BEZA and others) is incorrect.

Ver. 19. **Because in him God was pleased that the whole fulness should dwell.**—As in ver. 16, ὅτι introduces the ground of the last clause, and thus mediately of the whole preceding verse. It is not therefore a proof of the relative clause exclusively (STEIGER), nor is this to be excluded (MEYER). 'Εν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι may be simply rendered; the finite verb εὐδόκησεν leads to a will, a personal author as final cause, over against a becoming of necessity: on this account Θεός is the self-evident subject, hence not specially indicated; ἐν αὐτῷ is to be joined with κατοικῆσαι, it is placed first emphatically, and denotes the same as in the foregoing; πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα is the accusative subject of the infinitive, and according to the context, without the necessity of supplying anything, the whole fulness of Him, who had formed the decree (Eph. iii. 19: "all the fulness of God;" Col. ii. 9: "of the God-head"). [With this rendering, the E. V. agrees, but supplies *Father* instead of God, marking, it is true, an obvious antithesis between Christ (the subject hitherto), and the new one. But the impersonal form of the verb is not strictly correct. ELLICOTT renders: "the whole fulness of God was pleased to dwell," making πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα the subject of the finite verb. The question is only a grammatical one, as the dogmatical result is the same in either case. See ELLICOTT *in loco*.—R.] On πλήρωμα, compare Eph. i. 10; on κατοικῆσαι, Eph. iii. 17; on εὐδόκησεν, Eph. i. 5. To regard πλήρωμα as the fulness of the Gentiles and totality of Israel (SCHLEIERMACHER), is as unfounded, as to understand it, from the terminology of Valentin, of the complex of Æons (BAUR). HOFMANN also is in error, in understanding it as the fulness of that which is, making Christ the subject of εὐδόκησεν; too artificial. [WORDSWORTH, after giving two interpretations: 1. that God the Son was pleased; 2. that God was pleased, with a preference for (1), adds "on the whole, we may perhaps affirm, that the Apostle designedly placed εὐδόκησεν here without any limitation of a nominative expressed, in order to bring out the truth more fully that the εὐδοκία is to be ascribed to the Father in the Son, and to the Son in the Father, and that there is perfect unity in will and operation in both."—R.]

Ver. 20. **And by him to reconcile all things unto himself.**—*Locus hic torquet interpretes et vicissim ab illis torquetur* (DAVENANT). The force of καί is clear: "this indwelling (ver. 19) is the foundation of the reconciliation" (BENGEL). Δι' αὐτοῦ, *i. e.*, Christ, is placed emphatically first, denoting the known mediation. The main difficulty is found in ἀποκαταλλάξαι εἰς αὐτόν. The verb occurs only here, ver. 21 and Eph. ii. 16; here with εἰς αὐτόν, in the last passage with τῷ θεῷ. Καταλλάσσειν, Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19: τῷ θεῷ, ἑαυτῷ; 1 Cor. vii. 11: τῷ ἀνδρί. The meaning is: to reconcile, strengthened by ἀπό. So that the one reconciled is freed, removed from something; open, conscious, outspoken enmity is not meant, rather concealed unconscious estrangement and separation of one or two parts (HOFMANN): but it is found only in him who is reconciled, not in him who reconciles. See on Eph. ii. 16. With MEYER we hold as follows: sin began among the angels, and came, was brought from the angelic world to the race of men (Jno. viii. 44; 2 Cor. xi. 3; Eph. i. 10); thereby the whole creation was disturbed in its harmony, "was made subject to vanity," in "the bondage of corruption," and suffered according to the saying: *delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi* (comp. Rom. viii. 19–22). In Christ the act of reconciliation is accomplished, and this reconciliation is to unfold itself in all directions unto the *palingenesia* (Matt. xix. 28; 2 Pet. iii. 15), to the coming (*Parusie*) of Christ (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28). The aorist infinitive denotes the historical fact; εἰς αὐτόν instead of the usual dative ἑαυτῷ marks the direction, and consequently the gradually accomplished development. We meet here the comprehensive and classical idea of reconciliation, which is considerably modified with respect to the universe, as well as to the human race and the angelic world, as is afterwards indicated. It is therefore incorrect to identify ἀποκαταλλάξαι with ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, Eph. i. 10 (MELANCHTHON, GROTIUS, BAEHR and others), or in accordance with this view, to apply εἰς αὐτόν to Christ (LUTHER and others) and not to God, as the context requires. [E. V., "to Himself," correctly applies it.—R.] Nor is τὰ πάντα to be limited to intelligent beings, or to men only (A-LAPIDE and others) or to *universam ecclesiam* (BEZA); nor does the verb mean; "the removal of reciprocal enmity" (STOLZ, SCHLEIERMACHER and others). [ELLICOTT, while objecting to any dilution of "reconcile," or limitation of τὰ πάντα, cautions against the irreverence of far-reaching speculations on the reconciliation of the finite and infinite. "It *does* say that the eternal and incarnate Son is the '*causa medians*' by which the absolute totality of created things shall be restored into its primal harmony with its Creator—more than this it *does not* say, and where God is silent it is not for man to speak." EADIE: "The one Reconciler is the head of these vast dominions, and in Him meet and merge the discordant elements which sin had introduced The humanity of Jesus bringing all creatures around it, unites them to God in a bond which never before existed—a bond which has its origin in the mystery of redemption. Thus all things in heaven and earth feel the effect of man's renovation." The view of Braune, that this will find its full development at the coming of Christ, is not in opposition to the above view. See EADIE and ALFORD, also DE WETTE.—R.]

Having made peace through the blood of his cross.—Εἰρηνοποιήσας naturally

and grammatically agrees with the latent subject of *εὐδόκησεν*, God. The verb, only here, like the substantive *εἰρηνοποιός* (Matt. v. 9) is clear in its meaning. The aorist participle indicates the modality of "reconcile," as Eph. i. 19. Both acts are contemporaneous, conceived of as one, this does not ante-date the other [as E. V. implies—R.]. "Through the blood" marks the act as one of royal judgment and priestly sacrifice (Rom. iii. 25: Heb. iv. 14, 18, 20; 1 Pet. i. 19); while "of His cross" marks the shedding of blood as a consequence of the punishment to which He devoted Himself, in humblest obedience (Phil. ii. 18), in innocence for our sake, in holiness to make us holy. Both denote the definite, historical act, over against all spiritualistic conceptions, as well as Christ's suffering and death over against our moral or ascetic works. In order to preclude any materialistic or magical views of the blood of Christ, Paul reaffirms; **by him**, thus making prominent the Person of Him, who had shed His blood, and thereby made peace with God. ["I say" added in E. V. conveys the meaning.—R.]—Besides this repetition, designed to guard against false views, there is added, in explanation of the object, which has been and shall be reconciled, made partaker of the peace: **Whether there be things on earth, or things in heaven** (comp. ver. 16).—Here "earth" stands first, because he has been just speaking of the act on earth, by which the reconciliation begins. It is not easy to determine how the reconciliation of angels may be conceived of, since it cannot be applied to wicked ones, who remain unreconciled and are condemned, and the good need no reconciliation, only sustaining power. This difficulty leads us to refrain from any explanation, which would be at best a mere surmise. [See above on *τὰ πάντα*, which is specified here. ELLICOTT remarks: "How the reconciliation of Christ affects the spiritual world—whether by the annihilation of '*posse peccare*,' or by the infusion of a more perfect knowledge, or (less probably) some restorative application to the fallen spiritual world—we know not, and we dare not speculate." WORDSWORTH specifies a fourfold reconciliation, 1. Between God and man. 2. Between angels and man. 3. Between Jew and Gentile. 4. Between man and the inferior creatures. Under the last particular he refers to the attempt of false teachers to mar this work of universal reconciliation, by forbidding the *free use of the creatures*, chap. ii. 20, 21. This is open to the objection stated below.—R.] The disjunctive force of *εἴτε* forbids the idea of reconciliation of the two parts with each other (ERASMUS), nor do "things on earth," "things in heaven," favor the view, that Jews and Gentiles had become hostile to each other on account of heavenly and earthly things, matters of Divine worship and principles related thereto, but should now be reconciled (SCHLEIERMACHER). Nor does this refer to the reconciliation of the Jews and Gentiles to each other and with the world of spirits, nor to the final conversion and blessedness of the demons (ORIGEN), nor to a tendency at least thereto (OLSHAUSEN).

Application. Vers. 21–23.

Ver. 21. **And you.**—*Καὶ ὑμᾶς*, as Eph. ii. 1, to begin a new sentence. There is an anacoluthon in the construction, since the reading is *ἀποκατηλλάγητε*, not *ἀποκαταλλάξαι*. See critical note[14]. [The additional note gives the authorities for the reading Braune rejects. So great is the preponderance in its favor, that the translator feels bound to differ from the author here. The anacoluthon is not so strong with this reading; *ὑμᾶς* is the object of the verb, though *νυνὶ δέ* intervenes.—R.] There is no reason for joining "and you," with its immediate attributive, to the preceding sentence (LACHMANN and others). [The better punctuation is that of E. V. and most modern editors, beginning a new sentence or paragraph here.—R.] *Καί* is not merely a copulative particle (and); but is = "even," "precisely," as the following characteristic requires: **that were sometime alienated and enemies**, *ποτὲ ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθρούς*.—With *ποτέ* he refers to their past condition, and with emphasis, as its position indicates, in praise and thanksgiving, the participle is imperfect. On "alienated," see Eph. ii. 12. Neither "from the commonwealth of Israel," from that passage, nor "from the life of God," from Eph. iv. 18, is to be supplied (BAEHR); the context clearly suggests "from God." But more than alienation is mentioned, they had passed into enmity of which the former is the germ; *ἐχθρούς* is therefore active, enemy against God (Rom. viii. 7). It is incorrect to consider it as passive, *invisos deo* (Rom. v. 10, STEIGER), since it is enmity, not on the part of God, but of men, which is extirpated, out of which they are delivered in the reconciliation.—**As to your understanding in wicked works**, *τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς*.—Their enmity is thus described. The article refers to a known previous disposition and mode of conduct. The simple dative is one of *reference;* "in" marks the sphere in which the alienation and enmity manifested itself. Both belong to "alienated" as well as "enemies." On *διάνοια*, see Eph. ii. 3; iv. 18; 1 Jno. v. 20. [ELLICOTT: "the higher intellectual nature especially as shown in its practical relations." "Understanding," "mind" (as distinguished from heart in E. V.) is the correct rendering, though Braune, referring it to the state rather than to the faculty itself, has *Gesinnung*, disposition.—R.] This manifests itself actively; in it the "wicked works" have their ground and soil. [The form *τ. ἔργ. τοῖς πον.* emphasizes the character of the works.—R.] The phrase includes all works which are done contrary to God's command, or if formally in accordance with the law, yet from carnal appetites and propensities. It is incorrect to govern *τῇ διανοίᾳ* by *ἐχθρούς* (ERASMUS: "enemies to reason") or to consider it as the ground: through their disposition (MEYER), through their reason (LUTHER), since the cause of the enmity cannot be found in this organ or in this disposition, which is a product as respects the enmity. Nor does *ἐν ἔργοις* depend on *διανοίᾳ* (BEZA, BAEHR).—**Yet now hath he reconciled**, *νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατάλλαξεν*. — [Braune, reading *ἀποκαταλλάγητε* renders: "now you are reconciled."—R.] *Νυνί* marks the present which begins with the reconciliation, when the readers have become par-

takers of it; δέ marks the resumption of the thought uninterrupted by the parenthesis [describing their previous condition—R.], like the Latin *inquam.* "Reconciled" is an act through Christ, (ver. 20) not of Christ (Greek fathers, CALVIN, CALOV., others). Compare 2 Cor. v. 19. [The subject throughout is God.—R.]

Ver. 22. "**In the body of his flesh through death.**—This sets forth in twofold manner the way or the means of reconciliation. *First:* "In the body of his flesh." This describes the earthly, sensible, historical appearance of Christ. Sirach xvi. 23: ἀνθρωπος πόρνος ἐν σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, where σαρκός refers to the sensual lusting. Here the reference is to the Redeemer and Reconciler, who had taken upon Him our flesh and blood and appeared in the life and history of our race; ἐν is to be taken locally. [ALFORD: "The situation or element of the reconciliation." ELLICOTT: "the *substratum* of the action is pointed to by ἐν."—R.] It is entirely foreign to the context to suppose "of his flesh" is in contrast with the body "of the church," as ver. 20 (BENGEL). The antithesis is less docetic false teachers according to ii. 23 (STEIGER), or the glorified body of the Risen One, 1 Cor. xv. 44 (SCHENKEL). or exaggerated doctrine of angels (MEYER) than this, that the work of Redemption was far too easily separated from the person of Christ and His historical, human nature in the form of a servant. The expression is evidently anti-spiritualistic. *Secondly:* "through death," [the means, instrumental cause.—R.] renders prominent the exit from this natural life, in short, the suffering and death referred to in ver. 20; the entrance into this life through birth must have corresponded with such an exit. Hence it is not strange that Paul speaks often of the latter, but never of the former *ex professo.*

To present you holy and unblameable and unreproveable in his sight.—The end to be attained. "To present you" depends on the verb "reconciled." What has occurred to the Christian in this reconciliation is something to be preserved, unfolded, perfected. The God who effects reconciliation, effects more, as Eph. v. 27. The subject is not the subject of the passive ἀποκαταλλάγητε, but of the active [*i. e.*, of the verb ἀποκατάλλαξεν, as most read—R.]; the accusative ὑμᾶς is the object not the subject of the infinitive (MEYER, SCHENKEL). Certainly the immediate result of the reconciliation, the righteousness imputed for the sake of Christ, is not meant (HUTHER and others). The three adjectives ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους mark the continued effect of the reconciliation, *viz.*. moral purity in three directions. As "holy," ἅγιοι, they are consecrated to God, live to God, die to the world, have conducted and shown themselves as such; as "unblameable," ἄμωμοι, they are free from the faults and stains of sin; as unreprovable, ἀνέγκλητοι, they are not accused by their neighbors. BENGEL is not incorrect in his: *erga deum, respectu vestri, respectu proximi.* [ALFORD and ELLICOTT follow MEYER in referring the first to the *positive*, the latter two to the negative side of holiness. DAVENANT deems it the aggregation of three similar ideas. On the whole Braune's view, which is that of EADIE, is much preferable. —R.] "In his sight," κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ, refers undoubtedly to the Judgment, hence according to the context we may apply it to Christ. Comp. 2 Cor. v. 10. [ALFORD seems most correct; referring it to the day of Christ's appearing; but before His *i. e.*, God's presence. ELLICOTT doubts the former reference, but renders: "before Him, God not Christ." The passage undoubtedly refers to *justitia inhærens*, as the necessary result of the reconciliation which gave to the believer *justitia imputata.* So CALVIN, but, as HOOKER judiciously remarks, "whensoever we have any of these (actual, inherent or imputed holiness) we have all—they go together."—R.]

Ver. 23. **If at least ye continue in the faith.**—God's act for and upon them is not carried out to a blessed consummation without subjective advance and personal activity. Εἴγε marks a condition, about which there is no doubt. [ALFORD: "assuming that."—R.] It is the mildest, most delicate method of calling attention to the necessity of faith (BLEEK), and seems to belong to "present," rather than to depend on the finite verb, ver. 21 (BENGEL). See on Eph. iii. 2; iv. 21. Ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει is construed, as Rom. vi. 1; xi. 22, 23; 1 Tim. iv. 16. [Stronger than μένετε, implying with the dative, *rest* at a place, perseverance to and rest in the end, "persist" (ALFORD, ELLICOTT).—R.] The article marks the faith as definite; an indefinite one, after their own pleasure, does not suffice.—**Grounded and settled and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel.** —["Grounded and settled and not being moved away" is the literal construction. The E. V. seems to make "moved away" co-ordinate with "continue."—R.] The modality of the persistence is thus denoted: 1. Τεθεμελιωμένοι (see on Eph. iii. 18), whose antithesis is χωρὶς θεμελιόυ (Luke vi. 49: "without a foundation"), refers to an objectively given foundation, placed upon which they still stand. This is a reference to Christ, to God's grace in Him, not to the hope (MEYER). 2. Ἑδραῖοι *dicit internum robur, quod fideles ipsi habent; quemadmodum ædificum primo quidem fundamento recte solideque inniti, deinde vero sua etiam mole probe cohærere et firmiter consistere debet* (BENGEL), 1 Cor. xv. 58. [These two denote the positive side of the modality of their persistence; then the negative follows.—R.] 3. Μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος εὐαγγελίου marks, through the present participle passive, what is very possible, likely to enter every moment from without and within; circumstances, purposes and suggestions, as well as lusts and selfish thought and desire can easily move, so that they are moved away from the hope of the gospel, held up before them as an aim (not a point of support—SCHENKEL), and both sure and glorious as belonging to the gospel (see on Eph. i. 18). [ALFORD makes the hope subjective, but grounded on the objective, and the genitive possessive. ELLICOTT says: "the hope arising from, evoked by the Gospel,"—subjective, therefore: "τοῦ εὐαγγ. is the genitive of the origin or the originating agent"—which is preferable. EADIE thus discriminates between the three expressions: "the first epithet alludes to the cause, the second to its effect, the third depicts a general result,—as the use of μή seems to indicate." Μή is usual and proper, however,

in such a sentence as this—see WINER's *Gram.* p. 443.—R.] Μετά refers to the inward change in being moved, ἀπό to removal from the given object, thereby effected. — **Which ye have heard**, denotes a fact which takes away all excuse, they know it, it has been told them. [ELLICOTT objects to "have" in the E. V. without reason, as the inexcusableness rests upon the fact that it has already been heard, thus best expressed.—R.]—It has been made efficient for them, and not for them alone: **And which was preached to every creature which is under heaven,** =in the whole world. The command of Christ, Mark xvi. 15: "preach the gospel to every creature" has begun to be carried out. "Preached to every creature" is not hyperbolical (MEYER), nor is κτίσις to be limited to the Gentiles. [ALFORD incorrectly renders: "in the whole creation." EADIE and ELLICOTT call this hyperbole, though agreeing with Braune's next remark. —R.] The Apostle prophetically sees as accomplished what has as yet only begun, and marks the universality of Christianity. *Sane undiquaque vulgatum evangelium Christi, ne quid cogitarent Colossenses de mutanda fide, quæ jam ab omnibus esset recepta* (ERASMUS). [On the phrase, "which is under heaven," ELLICOTT remarks, that it characterizes the κτίσις as ἐπίγειος, including, however, thereby, all mankind.—R.]

Whereof I Paul am made a minister.—See on Eph. iii. 1. [MEYER makes here "three considerations" enforcing their "not being moved away"—It would be, 1) inexcusable for themselves, because they had heard the gospel; 2) inconsistent with the universality of the gospel "preached to every creature;" 3) contrary to the personal relation of the Apostle to the gospel, "whereof I Paul," etc.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Christian knowledge.* The progress of Paul's thanksgiving for the faith and love of the Church to supplication for their advance in true knowledge derives its motive from the end in view, *viz.*, Christian walk. Herein is implied: *First:* the basis of Christian knowledge is the Christian morality of the perceiving subject, in its fundamental traits and principles, in faith and love. Here it begins, and hence advance is made to and in the former. The subject of knowledge must also be correctly situated on account of the object of knowledge, and the organ of knowledge in the knowing subject must, at the same time, be first acted upon, that it may enjoy healthy activity and the reward of sound knowledge. Yet is faith itself an immediate knowing, and love, a desire which directly grasps the objects of faith, so that what makes an impression in faith, can be intelligently conceived. *Second:* the *object* of Christian knowledge is the will of God, in the unity of that will in creation, law and redemption, hence in the visible and invisible, in the temporal and eternal, in the moral and intelligent world, both what was designed in creation and redemption, and what was commanded in word as precept. *Third:* the *effect* of Christian knowledge is essentially a re-action upon the Christian walk, and thus they reciprocally further each other. *Fourth:* the way to Christian knowledge is essentially a life of practical morality. *Fifth:* its *course* is like that of the Christian life, a gradual advance, moving and developing itself in various experiences, temptations and circumstances.

2. *The Christian walk* has its *ground* in the fact of redemption, which has been decreed and ordained by God the Father, mediated and accomplished through the Son; its *beginning*, in the appropriation of this fact of objective redemption and subjective acceptance; its *standard*, in the example of our Lord Jesus Christ; its *motive*, in pleasing this Lord; its *activity*, in good works, according to the various relations of life in which we are placed; its *modality* in this, that what is done, is done from inward constraint and not from calculation; its *development*, in this, that it perceives more clearly each moment the will of God, grasps it more securely, retains it more firmly, proves it more widely; its *genuineness*, in the joy with which it bears and forbears, and controls itself with ever increasing strength; its *tone*, in gratitude for what God had done to and in and for One, and its *aim* in the eternal heritage in heaven, of which an earnest is given within us.

3. *The Apostle's conception of God.* *God*, who is the beginning and end for the Christian, is conceived of, not as absolute *substance*, but as an *absolute Person*, in substance a Spirit, in character *Love*: here especially in the latter aspect. He has His will, and His εὐδοκεῖν (ver. 19) wills itself as the good, wills it with energy and almightiness, and accomplishes His will in general and particular alike. In this recession (*Zurücktreten*) of the absolute substance behind the freedom of the absolute Subject, the right of Pantheism and Emanatism is taken away, in the precession (*Vortreten*) of His almighty and saving Love, that of Deism and Naturalism. The personality of the Living One, and the Life of the Absolute Person are the cardinal points of the Christian's belief in God. Against Indifference "the whole fulness" of God (ver. 19) speaks. By this is meant the fulness of Love and Holiness, of Wisdom and Power, of Grace and Majesty and Blessedness, which bursts forth in the works of Creation, Redemption, Sanctification and Glorification, but which neither is nor can be exhausted in the world; although immanent in the world, He far transcends it. Only in the Son of His Love is "the whole fulness" to be seen and found. Hence there is a reference to a Triune relation, since such fulness of God, the Living One, did not first come in flow with the creation, but moved already in Him, who is before and above all creatures.—The self-existence of God the Father, who is αἴτιος πάντων τῶν ὄντων, is indicated; on Him the Son Himself depends and His activity in the works of Creation and Redemption.

4. *The Person of Christ* is more accurately described in a threefold relation:

a) *His relation to God* is set forth in the phrases: ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, "the Son of His Love," (ver. 13); εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀοράτου, "the image of the invisible God," (ver. 15). The first expression marks Him as the object of the Father's love, which has in Him, nothing that can grieve it, holy as it is, or that it must first subdue; thus His Holiness, Sinlessness are im-

plied, on account of which it is He, in whom the forgiveness of sin is obtained. The other phrase leads into the substance of the glory of God, manifesting itself first and most of all in Him, and denotes also His Divine Personality; He is indeed the Image of a Personality, so that he must both have existence and be a Person, especially as "all the fulness" of God is said to dwell in the Son of Man. It may be conceded to HOFMANN (*Schriftbeweis*, I. 153-158), BEISCHLAG (*Christologie des N. T.*, 228-233), SCHENKEL and others, that the historical Christ must be made the subject for the most part (ver. 13). [See EXEG. NOTES on ver. 15.—R.] But what gives to this One His position in history and His Dignity, lies above this history in his super-terrestrial position and intrinsically Divine Dignity. Indeed the historical events pre suppose the relation of the Son to the Father, His Divinity, and do not first constitute Him the Son, or God the Father, or Him a Person, who did not exist before, or was not yet a Person nor the Son of God.

b) *His relation to the world* is described by πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, "first-born of every creature" (ver. 15), and further explained by the confirmatory clause (ver. 16), "in him were all things created"—"by him and to him" (ἔκτισται), and sharply defined in ver. 17: "He is before all things and in him all things subsist." In the given connexion there is *first*, a temporal definition (πρὸ πάντων), so that here His pre-existence is decidedly and expressly asserted, in agreement with Jno. xvii. 5: "πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι, "before the world was;" i. 1: ἐν ἀρχῇ, "in the beginning;" Eph. i. 4: "before the foundation of the world." *Second:* Prominence is given to the Personality, denoted both by πρωτότοκος and the creation of God "*in*," "by" and "to Him," as in Jno. i. 1: πρὸς τὸν θεόν; viii. 58: ἐγὼ εἰμί. So that the Apostle here treats of a pre-existent Person, not merely of a pre-existent principle, or of a historical Person, as though the pre-existent principle first became personal in Jesus at the Incarnation, or the personality had previously been only ideal. Compare THOMASIUS, *Christi Person und Werk*, pp. 60-66. *Thirdly*: His Creatorship excludes any creatureship in Him, and the identity of the Creator and Redeemer is so affirmed, that He who became man is placed more under the idea "God" than the idea "man." On this account Theodoret aptly says, "not as having creation for a sister, but as begotten before all creation." *Fourthly:* Our text defines Him, not as Him, ὑφ' οὗ all things were created, and yet as active in the creation: δι' αὐτοῦ; He is not simply an archetype of the creation for the Creator. *Fifthly:* He is emphatically indicated as the foundation and centre of the world and its history, its stability, and development. [CHRYSOSTOM interprets this passage and Eph. ii. 22: "as teaching that Christ is the Living Centre, to which all things in creation converge, the Divine Keystone in the arch of the Universe, on which the whole fabric leans; but he warns his readers against supposing that Christ Himself is *consubstantial* with the creatures whom He made and upholds" (WORDSWORTH).—R.]

c) *His relation to the Church* is described by "Head of the body, the Church;" "beginning;" "first-born from the dead." On the first expression, see on Eph. i. 22. It is the organizing power, dwelling in Him, through which the Church has come into being. The other expression refers to the victory over death, as the fact upon which the secure status of the Church rests; as indeed Paul appears especially as a witness of the resurrection, wherever as Apostle he founds churches. All views which will not recognize and appreciate the Person of Christ as the centre of His work and His Church, as Divine in origin and nature, as eternal, pre-terrestrial and super-terrestrial, efficient both in Creation and Redemption, degenerate into a false speculation against which this Epistle to the Colossians contends. The question is not raised here, not even a hint given, how we are to conceive of Divinity and humanity united in One; nothing is said upon this point; hence Nestorian error does not lie so near, as SCHENKEL thinks, but rather Arian or Sabellian or Gnostic or another spiritual error, which volatilizes the eternal reality of the Person of Christ, or a dualistic one, which overshadows and crowds out the act of the Redeeming Subject by asceticism or legality, the so-called virtue of the subject to be redeemed.

5. *The Work of Christ*, with respect to God, from whom the world has apostatized through sin, is described as an ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα, "reconciling all things;" with respect to the state into which the world has fallen through sin, as ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις, "the redemption," and as to its *beginning* and *principle*, as ἡ ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, "the forgiveness of sins." First of all, the ultimate *cause* of Reconciliation and Redemption is God the Father (ver. 13: ὃς ἐῤῥύσατο, ver. 19: εὐδόκησεν—ἀποκαταλλάξαι), as in creation. The *Mediation* of these belongs, as in the creation, to the Son of God, as Theanthropos in His historical Personality (ver. 20: by Him—and that "through the blood of His Cross," ver. 22: "in the body of His flesh through death"); His Person has central importance, His suffering and death is *the climax.* He entered into the fellowship of humanity, which is the object of Divine wrath, endured in this fellowship the wrath of God resting upon it, gave Himself as a Sacrifice, holy and innocent, proved in His self-denying obedience, in His office as Saviour, that just as His Son in whom He was well pleased became man, so it was the man in whom He was well pleased,—so that the Father for the sake of this One could turn His complacency upon the whole race which through Him dies to sin, and turns to God in grateful love.

The work of Redemption, as to its *Object*, relates to the totality of the creatures, although it begins in the human race; as to its *Purpose*, it tends to a restitution of the creation, or to a bringing back of the creation to the path which it has forsaken, toward its proper consummation. The former marks the extent of the corruption of sin. Man is a prey to the "power of darkness," which forms the antithesis to the kingdom of Love, so that darkness, which is opposed to Love, is to be conceived of, rather, as moral, than intellectual. Will, as well as knowledge, religiousness and morality, social and political

relations, are effected and corrupted, and this can not only be affirmed of heathen (ver. 21: *ὑμᾶς*), but is applicable to Jews (ver. 13: *ἡμᾶς*). In the presence of this Redemption in Christ the advantages of Israel over the Gentiles disappear. The purpose of Redemption is directed, chiefly, to the internal sanctification of men, to the forgiveness of sin, extirpation of it and its consequences, to justification before God in the judgment within the conscience, and in the future at the last day (ver. 21). But it extends in ever wider circles, in order to permeate the whole creation, and bring all creatures and all relations to happiness and blessedness with Him into eternity. [To avoid any misconception, see EXEG. NOTES on ver. 20.—R.] Hence no dualistic view finds any justification here, in fact, dualism is anti-christian. The overcoming of the antagonisms, which are easily recognized, is thus set forth as a possibility and an indispensable task, and this is accomplished by ethical means, from the reconciliation of the world to the transformation of the world. [HENRY: Christ is the Mediator of reconciliation, who promises peace, as well as pardon, and brings into a state of friendship and favor at present, and will bring all holy creatures, angels as well as men, into one glorious and blessed society at last.—R.]

6. *The Church* in which the Redemption, objective in Christ, and accomplished by Him, is, and will be subjectively appropriated, is presented in our text in a two-fold aspect;

a) as respects its *region*—the militant and triumphant church, referred to in the expression, (ver. 18); *ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*;

b) as respects its *inner life: cœtus vocatorum et fidelium*, referred to in the expression (ver. 12): *ἅγιοι ἐν φωτί*, "saints in light." The *organism* of the church is indicated by the expression (ver. 18): "Head of the body, the church." Its *extent* is denoted by the former reference, its *vitality* by the latter, and its mission is to further, subjectively, the purpose of the work of Christ. It is by no means indifferent *how* one stands in the church and holds to her; but it is just as little without important influence, *whether* or *that* one belongs to her, as it is indifferent in what nation or family one is incorporated.

7. The *morality* of the individual within the church of Christ is defined as objectively caused (*ἅγιος*, "holy"), subjectively internal (*ἄμωμος*, "unblamable"), and constantly referred to God (*ἀνέγκλητος κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ*, "unreprovable in his sight"); and on that account conditioned by *faith*, which must prove itself in a two-fold manner, in its life and its substance, as right and correct, as genuine and true, as *fides qua* and as *fides quæ creditur;* it is indeed the *word of God become alive* in the Christian. This, at the same time, explains, why and that faith must be stable and independent of time and human opinions; it depends upon permanence.

8. *The Word of God*, which should be heard and proclaimed, requires living persons who have been filled and moved by it, whom it has first served, to serve it in turn. Here we find a direction for the establishment of public worship, in which the exposition and proclamation of the Word should not be wanting, as well as for the labors of Bible Societies, that should circulate God's Word, not merely in black and white, as copies from the press, like booksellers, and book binders, but in accordance with the organism and mission of the Church, in connexion with the efforts of Home and Foreign Missions.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

There is an order in prayer. Luther sets it forth in his explanation of the second Commandment [Luther's small catechism, the 2nd answer—on our Third Commandment.—R.]: "In all necessities call, pray, praise and give thanks." The call for help, the cry of distress, the entreaty, which necessity presses out, is the easiest, briefest, first, the prayer of an elementary pupil; the petition in perplexity for a *need* is an affair of the apprentice, who has learned first to pray for himself, and when further advanced, to offer supplications of unselfish love for others. The journeyman knows how to *give thanks* for gifts received, but the master *praises* the *giver*, not forgetting Him in His bounty. Whoever can and does do this, will not slight the easier part. Paul always goes from praise to thanksgiving, and from thanksgiving to supplication. He begins with the former, nor does he neglect the latter. Do you also? [The Apostle's order is that of mature Christian experience. But the other is that of the learner. It is also that of the Psalms. They usually begin with petition and end with praise. They were written in the times of preparation for Christ. How often Christians revert to David's method. The Old Testament still leads us to the New.—we pray first like the Psalmist, then like the Apostle.—R.]

Theory succeeds practice, as Philosophy follows Poetry. To live the truth is more than to know the truth. To perceive the truth is rather a matter of the sanctified will, than of the well-stored memory or the isolated intellect.—Being filled with the knowledge of the truth, is to know both what is nearest and what is most remote. Reason is both a telescope, to look into distant eternal things, and a microscope to inspect and understand the things at hand, in house and heart, in life and business, but to adjust the glasses aright is not hers, it belongs to the will, it is not an intellectual, but a moral act. Christian living is not the product, but the producer of Christian thinking.—The more you do, the more you become.—Only when bearing fruit, does the Christian grow.—Self-redemption is a falsity, and forgiveness of sins, without Christ, a lie. The folly of the sixteenth century, when people bought absolution with money, is laughed at, but why should we not also ridicule the blindness of the nineteenth century, when people forgive their own guilt and sin, and fancy they get absolution at a still cheaper rate. Those who credit Christ, no longer have a creditor in God; in this privilege unbelief has no share.—The Christian cannot divide or divorce God and Christ, God and the world, Creation and Redemption, Christ's Person and Work, this world and the next, faith and love, faith and God's word, faith and forgiveness, faith and bliss, religion and morality, church and Christianity, sin and corruption, grace and salvation, salvation and sanctification, though it is he who accurately

distinguishes them.—The truth in Christ is the greatest paradox of life; the cross is a throne, death is life, weakness is strength, defeat is victory, gain is loss.—Christ, who satisfies all the needs of the human heart, begins with pardon, with grace that ends in blessedness with God. He blesses man in himself and goes on until He completes the whole creation—to the choirs of angels.—The Bible is the jewel of all the literature of the world; in the ring of the Bible the gospel is the diamond.—The news and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures come to us in personalities, and in him who understands them they become again personal.

STARKE:—You flatter yourself that you are a good Christian because you do nothing wicked! Is a tree good then, that does not bear thorns and thistles? If you are not diligent in good works, your Christianity is nothing, your imagination is vain, your hope is lost. We must grow in knowledge, grow in the power of God, grow in spiritual walk and in holiness. If a new-born child does not grow perceptibly, it is a bad sign. So it is with a Christian also.—To be patient in so many sufferings of this present time, and long-suffering amid so many adversities are excellent gifts of God. But those are far advanced, who endure evil not only with patience, but with joy also.—Eternal life is an inheritance, hence it can be trifled away with sin, but not earned with good works. For a little child, though it have done nothing as yet, comes to its inheritance as well as the larger ones, who have done much.—Sad condition of men through the fall of Adam! once monarchs over all creatures, they must now be subject to the devil and his empire.—[Believers also are first born, and enjoy the liberty of the First Born.—The dignity of believers surpasses that of angels, for they are united with the Son of God, who is higher than all angels.—R.]

RIEGER:—Darkness, ignorance, doubt, inability man traces to himself; vexation and impatience break out of this darkness. But the gospel first makes known that behind this there is concealed a rule and power of darkness, out of which a deliverance is required, deliverance accomplished by means of right and justice moreover.—It was not done by the Father's sending the Son into the world, as a great witness of His love, to tell much of His name, and thus lead us away from our hostile disposition toward God, or direct us to confidence in Him: but God laid our sins and those of the whole world on this our Mediator, accepted His obedience, His sufferings, His sacrifice and the shedding of His blood as a ransom-price for us.—There is no doubt the corruption in heathenism was greater than now, although we, who spring from Christian, perhaps specially sainted parents, are still wicked and born sinners; yet much is ameliorated in our hereditary disease, and the favorable opportunity for us to find God as Love, is much facilitated. But this must be regarded rather as an advantage of our age, and not one of our persons. Through neglect of this grace of our age, we may become again as bad and worse than a heathen.—[The praise of the blood of Christ reaches to our being presented holy and unreprovable before God.—R.]

HEUBNER:—The heart of a Christian is a large heart. Paul had already entered into intimate fellowship with this Church although he had never seen it. What attracts the heart of one Christian to another? How easily true Christians at once understand each other!—The more fruitful our walk, the more does our knowledge of God grow. True knowledge can come only out of and with action. It is not only the knowledge that increases, but the power is enlarged, the capacity of enduring, holding out in conflict, as well as of cherishing kindly sentiments toward enemies—and of doing both with joy. We must live ourselves into Christianity.—Those who do not desire to become holy or to be "made meet," may be external adherents, but are not citizens of the kingdom of heaven.—Christ is *before* all with respect to time; He does not belong to the series of beings created in time. This "*before*" *of priority* naturally includes the "before" of *preëminence*.—Justification precedes, sanctification follows: the heart must first be stilled, then it can collect itself and prepare for sanctification. The latter is the end of the reconciliation. Why then will we ever invert this order? Because we would ascribe pardon to our merit, and not to the merit of Christ.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—A mind, that would fully apprehend the truth of the gospel, will soon mark a voice in itself, when something important and essential is omitted, while on the other hand, good sense will soon warn us, if we allow ourselves to be misled, so as to insert in the Scripture, through artifice, something which is not there.—Only when *He* has become to us the knowledge of the Divine will, is there a walk worthy of Him.—Expanded knowledge is itself a consequence of fruitfulness in good works.—The more plain the will of God becomes to us, the more we see what God has laid upon us to do; so much the more do we encounter opposition, the more difficult it becomes to instil the same view into others, and the more does this spiritual conduct of life enter into spheres which appear foreign to it.—Oh that we so investigated the Scriptures, that it tended to edification!—Paul makes sanctification dependent upon "being grounded" in faith, and upon not being "moved away" from the hope of the gospel, which is no other than that of the consummation of the kingdom of God in Christ.

PASSAVANT:—At the time of the council of Constance, three cardinals in their ride met a poor shepherd weeping on the beach. They asked him why he wept so. "Out of gratitude," he answered, pointing to a worm, "that God has made me a man and not a poor worm like that." What would have been the gratitude of the poor shepherd, had the cardinals revealed to him, that God could, besides, make him meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.—Darkness is a kingdom, and this kingdom has its principalities and powers, and their artifice and malice is great; their might is great and the abyss is deep.—Many a one may appear pure and refined in conduct and culture, whose conscience sleeps, whose heart deceives itself; it is a dream of rest and peace, a false dream of life: sin can scatter over the whole life of a sinner her poppy leaves.—There exists among highly cultivated

minds, among educated people, an alienation from God, and in consequence an enmity, which seems to arise not so much from the ordinary sinful flesh, as from the temerity and pride of the thinking or subtilizing faculty in us, which indeed is also flesh. ["One can—and the inconsistency is not rare—worship Jesus Christ as God, and yet not have acknowledged Him as God formally and with the understanding; the heart makes Him God, the understanding makes Him man, still with most men the heart cannot cure the mind of its error, but is rather led astray itself." Quotation in Passavant.—R.] "To extend the law of Christ," says Theodorus, "they did not use carnal weapons. The power of convincing speech alone attested the power of these divine precepts. Every where exposed to the greatest dangers, they endured in all cities, through which they passed, the most shameful and cruel mal-treatment: scourge and rack, prisons, executions and martyrdoms of all kinds were daily their lot: yet though the executioner could kill the bearers of the divine message, they could not kill the message itself. It proved still mightier after their death: the gospel survived with equal vital power the efforts and the rage of Barbarians and Romans: out of the funeral pile where they would bury the memory of those fishermen and tent makers, it went forth yet more brilliantly and gloriously."

[Henry:—The Apostle heard that they were good, and he prayed that they might be better.—1. That they might be knowing, intelligent Christians. 2. That their conversation might be good. 3. That they might be strengthened. Vers. 12 sq. Here is the summary of the doctrine of the gospel concerning the great work of our redemption by Christ. It comes in here not as the matter of a sermon, but as the matter of a thanksgiving.—He does not discourse of the work of redemption in the natural order of it; for then he would speak of the purchase of it first, and afterwards of the application of it. But here he inverts the order; because in our sense and feeling of it, the application goes before the purchase. We first find the benefits of redemption in our own hearts, and then are led by those streams to the original and Fountain-head.—They who are not saints on earth, will never be saints in heaven. All who are designed for heaven hereafter, are prepared for heaven now. They who have the inheritance of sons, have the education of sons, and the disposition of sons.—This meetness for heaven is the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts; which is part of payment, and assures the full payment.—The greatest enemies to God, who have stood at the greatest distance and bidden Him defiance, may be reconciled, if it is not their own fault.—There was such a value in the blood of Christ, that on account of Christ's shedding it, God was willing to deal with men upon new terms, and bring them under a covenant of grace; and *for His sake* and in consideration of His death upon the cross, to pardon and accept to favor all who comply with them.—This gospel may be preached to every creature; for it excludes none who do not exclude themselves.—Paul was a great Apostle; but he looks upon it as the highest of his titles of honor, to be a minister of the gospel of Jesus Christ.—R.]

[Burkitt:—Ver. 10. Our fruitfulness should be an universal fruitfulness, an humble and self-denying fruitfulness, a proportionable fruitfulness, an abounding and abiding fruitfulness; this is to be fruitful in every good work.—Ver. 12. This meetness is a spiritual blessing, a transcendent favor, a discriminating favor, an everlasting favor; eternity will be too short to spend in the admiration of it; let such as are interested in it, now begin the work upon earth, of giving thanks to the Father for it.—R.]

[Eadie:—Ver. 10. Superabundance of one kind of fruit is no compensation for the absence of another. "Every good work" is inculcated. Such fruitfulness is not exhaustive. The tree grows healthfully while its fertility is so great.—Ver. 11. That peculiar position which necessitates the exercise of "patience and long suffering" should not induce despondency, as if it were inevitable fate, to be sullenly submitted to, but rather should there be joy that this Divine power is communicated, and that the mind is upborne in triumph, and enabled to hope and wait in quiet expectation.—Ver. 12. None but the saints, as being "light in the Lord" can dwell in that light. They who enjoy it are made meet for social intercourse. Selfishness vanishes before universal love, the intense yearnings of a spiritual brotherhood are developed and perfected.—Ver. 13. The one kingdom of God has an earthly and a celestial phasis. It resembles a city divided by a river, but still under the same municipal administration and having one common franchise.—Ver. 14. Forgiveness is more closely connected with redemption than any other blessing; it comes at once from the cross to the believing soul.—Vers. 15–19. The sentences in which Paul describes the rank and prerogative of Christ are like a bursting torrent. How he exults in the precious theme, and how his soul swells into impassioned panegyric!—Had the Divine Being remained alone, His glory would have been unseen and His praises unsung. Christ fitted up these "all things" "for Himself," in order that He might exhibit His glory, while He diffused happiness through creatures of innumerable worlds, and enabled them to behold His mirrored brightness and to reflect it.—At every point of His existence, it may be said of Him, "He is." What faith in power and extent should not be reposed in such a Saviour-God!—In all things He has the pre-eminence. None like Christ is the decision of faith, none but Christ is the motto of love.—Every grace as it is needed, and when it is needed, in every variety of phasis and operation, is wrapt up in that fulness which dwells in Christ.—Ver. 20. Blood shed on earth creates feuds to be extinguished only by other blood; but the blood of Christ's violent and vicarious death brings peace, restores alliance between heaven and earth.—Ver. 21. Man does not win his way back to the Divine favor by either costly offering or profound penitence. God re-unites him to Himself; has not only provided for such an alliance, but actually forms and cements it. The incarnation rightly understood, enhances the Redeemer's greatness.—Ver. 23. Thus a life

of faith is one of hope. The loss of faith is the knell of hope.—Man is not acted on mechanically by the grace of God, but his whole spiritual nature is excited to earnest prayer and anxious effort. The confidence of success inspirits them.—R.]

[BARNES: Vers. 9-11. It is a good time to pray for Christians when they are already prosperous, and are distinguished for zeal and love. We have then encouragement to do it.—Vers. 12-13. No words can express appropriately the goodness of God in thus making us heirs of light.—Vers. 15-18. In the affections of our hearts let the Saviour in all things have the pre-eminence. None should be loved by us as Christ is loved.—Ver. 19. In all our wants let us go to Christ, in whom all fulness dwells.—Ver. 20. What a glorious work is that of the gospel! It reconciles and harmonizes distant worlds.—R.]

[ROBERT HALL:—Ver. 19. In Jesus Christ "*all* fulness" dwells, for the supply of spiritual destitution. Fulness of *knowledge:* knowledge is the great distinction of the mind, and here is all spiritual knowledge. Christ is Himself the wisdom of God; to know HIM is to attain at once the highest knowledge. Fulness of *holiness;* holiness is the proper riches and beauty of the soul; and the subjects of Christ are created anew in holiness after His image. Fulness of consolation; the greatest comforts that ever visited the troubled heart of man are those which flow from Christ as their fountain. Fulness once more, as it respects the *inheritance* in reserve; of which the saints have at certain seasons a *present* sense and foretaste, though the light of eternity is required to display its real extent, to display the *accessible* fulness of the *present* Saviour.—R.]

AHLFELD: He who places the full Christian grace before his soul, will strive the more earnestly to possess it. 1) Wherein does it consist? 2) How may I gain what I still lack?—CARSTEN: Peace through His blood on the cross. 1) Between God and man, 2) Heaven and earth, 3) in each human breast — or 1) The world reconciled with God, 2) Heaven opened, 3) Conscience stilled.—LÖHE: A ladder that reaches from heaven to earth. 1) God the Father has set it through the Son of His Love; 2) the highest round, at first concealed, shines in the light of sanctification; 3) the second in that of justification; 4) the third in the bloody scene of Golgotha; and our Redemption.—KÖHLER: Thanksgiving for the benefit of Redemption; 1) end; 2) mode; 3) means; 4) Person of Redemption.

ZIMMERMAN: Strife of two kingdoms for the souls of sinners; 1) God the Father devised the struggle concerning us; 2) God the Son has won the victory and kingdom for us; 3) whoever abides in Him, has escaped the enemy.*

On the epistle for the 24th Sunday after Trinity [vers. 9-14. The Prot. Episcopal Book of Common Prayer, following that of the Church of England, uses vers. 3-12.—R.]—HEUBNER: The great change wrought in man by Christianity. 1) *Its nature:* a) new light, full of knowledge and wisdom; b) a new virtuous walk, worthy of God; c) the translation into a new kingdom; d) the eternal Redemption. 2) *The consequences:* a) what is the reason, if we have not yet experienced this change? b) what have we to do?—RAUTENBURG: The question respecting our growth in Christianity. 1) *Can we*—2) *will* we grow? 3) *Have* we grown?—Paul prays for the believers in Colosse: 1) that, 2) what, 3) where and when he prayed for them.—KAPFF: What is eternal blessedness? 1) Redemption for all evil; 2) blessed fellowship with God and all saints; 3) unspeakable joy and honor in the glory of the heavenly kingdom. — LORENZ: Darkness and light. 1) Man according to nature; 2) man according to grace.—FLOREY: Light, the believer's inheritance. 1) They *have* the light of *truth;* 2) they *walk* in the light of *virtue;* 3) they come into the light of blessedness.—BECK: How a share in the glorious power of God 1) makes us meet; 2) admonishes us to thanksgiving.

[BEVERIDGE: Ver. 12. The happiness of the saints in heaven. 1) What kind of persons they are, who are or shall be happy in the other world; they are saints. 2) The happiness they enjoy there; the inheritance in light. 3) They who desire to enjoy that happiness must be duly qualified for it; "made meet." 4) All who are so qualified must ascribe it wholly to God, and give Him thanks for it; "giving thanks," etc.—STEINHOFER: The economy of the Triune God in the work of our blessedness. 1) What God has determined according to the counsel of His own good pleasure; 2) what in His Son from all eternity for our salvation; 3) what actually takes place in us to the praise and glory of His name.—The three glorious names of Jesus (Begotten before every creature, first-born from the dead, Head of the Body) should awaken us 1) to an humble joy, 2) a complete faith, 3) a tender love to Him.—LISCO: The actual union of God with the human nature in Christ the ground of the most intimate re-union of humanity with God through Christ.—SCHENKEL: A fruitful teacher's duty to pray unceasingly for his people.—The Christian should not rest until he has fully known the will of God, 1) in its highest designs and ends; 2) according to its manifold methods and means.—How Christian life and Christian thought reciprocally condition each other. 1) Without Christian thought the Christian life is not plain. 2) Without Christian life Christian thought is not correct.—The blessing of Redemption: 1) Wherein it consists (forgiveness of sins); 2) whereby it is obtained (through the blood of Christ.)—Jesus Christ, the Risen One, the Head of the church: 1) Its Founder, 2) its Upholder, 3) its Ruler.—Jesus Christ, according to God's good pleasure, the Bearer of all fulness of humanity and of man. Consider then 1) His glory, 2) our poverty.—The threefold witness for the truth of the gospel: resting 1) on the antiquity, 2) the extent, 3) the power of the proclamation of the same.—R.]

* [These divisions are made to rhyme in German—a fashion in sermonizing that happily has not yet come into vogue in America: 1) *Gott der Vater hat den Kampf um uns ersonnen,* 2) *Gott der Sohn hat Sieg und Reich fur uns gewonnen;* 3) *wer in Ihm bleibt, der ist dem Feind entronnen.—R.*]

3. Joy of the Apostle in his suffering and labor.

(CHAPTER I. 24–29.)

24 Who [I][1] now rejoice in my [the][2] sufferings for you, and fill up that which is
behind [ὑστερήματα, deficiencies] of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's
25 sake, which is the church; Whereof I[3] am made [became][4] a minister according to
the dispensation of God which is [was] given to me for you, to fulfil the word of
26 God; *Even* [*To wit*] the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from genera-
tions [the ages and from the generations],[5] but now[6] is made manifest to his saints:
27 To whom God would [willed to] make known what *is* the riches of the glory of this
mystery among the Gentiles; which[7] is Christ in [or among][8] you, the hope of
28 glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wis-
dom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus [in Christ]:[9]
29 Whereunto I also labor, striving according to his working, which worketh in me
mightily.

1 Ver. 24.—Before νῦν some MSS. read ὅς, which is wanting in ℵ. A. B. C.; more likely to have been added for closer connexion with the preceding context, than to have been omitted. [Alford suggests that it is from the preceding termination. Rejected by all modern editors, though retained in E. V. Instead of "Who" read "I," or better "Now I rejoice."—R.]

2 Ver. 24.—[The E. V. follows Rec., which inserts μου after παθήμασιν. This reading is supported by no uncial authority except ℵ[3].; rejected by all modern editors, hence not noted by Braune. The E. V. undoubtedly gives the true sense.—R.]

3 Ver. 25.—ℵ. reads Παῦλος after ἐγώ, but not B and others; probably from ver. 23, *causa nexus*.

4 Ver. 25.—["Became," Alford, Ellicott, Coverdale (Test.).—R.]

5 Ver 26.—[The article of the Greek should be retained in English, to give definiteness: ages and generations "before us," Alford.—All older English versions omit it, however.—R.]

6 Ver. 26.—[Rec. with A. D. K. L., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Ellicott, Wordsworth, read νυνί; ℵ. B. C. F., Alford, νῦν.—R.]

7 Ver. 27.—[Ὅς is the reading of ℵ. C. D. K. L. Rec.; adopted by Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott, Wordsworth; ὅ is supported by A. B. F. G., Lachmann, Alford. Braune renders *welcher*, thus adopting the former reading.—R.]

8 Ver. 27.—[Ἐν ὑμῖν, literally "in you," but here "among you" also. Braune: "*bei Euch.*" See EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

9 Ver. 28.—[Ἰησοῦ is wanting in ℵ.[1] A. B. C. D.[1] F. G.; rejected by Tischendorf and modern editors generally. E. V. follows Rec., which inserts it. Uncial authority slight.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The joy in suffering. Ver. 24.—**Now I rejoice in my sufferings for you.**—"Now" marks the present, which is described by "in my sufferings for you;" precisely therein, surrounded, encompassed by sufferings "I rejoice." [EADIE: "'at the present time,' with the chain upon my wrist:—not, however, as if he had been sorrowful at a previous period."—R.] At other times he had his joy without bonds, in full freedom of activity for the gospel. The object of joy is not denoted by ἐν, but by ἐπί with the dative, Matth. xviii. 13; Luke i. 14; Acts xv. 21; 1 Cor. xiii. 6; xvi. 17, or by διά, Jno. xi. 15; 1 Thess. iii. 9. Only in Luke x. 20; Phil. i. 18 is the object introduced by ἐν τούτῳ. The object of his joy is that his sufferings had good fruit among the Gentiles. Comp. Phil. i. 12–20. It was in Rome that he had learned this; hence "now." The bitterness of sorrow cannot disturb his joy at the sweetness of the fruit. See Eph. iii. 1. Hence it is incorrect to consider νῦν a particle of transition (BAEHR), or of consecution, or τὰ παθήματα as the object of the joy (GROTIUS, HUTHER and others). Nor is ὑπέρ="instead of" (STEIGER), or "on account of" (*wegen*, STOLZ), or to be joined with χαίρω. The reference is neither to the occasion of the sufferings of the Apostle to the Gentiles, nor to his example, but to the fact, that his sufferings are for the good of the Church, as indicated by what follows. [EADIE agrees with STOLZ: "on account of." He was imprisoned because of his preaching to the Gentiles. This is true, but ALFORD's view agrees better with the text, context and Braune. "The preposition cannot here imply substitution—but strictly *in commodum vestri*, that you may be confirmed in the faith by—not my example merely—the glorification of Christ in my sufferings." So WINER: *zum Vortheil*, *Gram.* p. 358.—R.]

And fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ.—["And am filling up fully the lacking measures of the sufferings of Christ," ELLICOTT.—R.] Καί leads us forward from the subjective feeling to the objective state of the case (MEYER), but not from the particular (ὑμῶν) to the whole (LUECKE): nor is it= καὶ γάρ (BAEHR), nor yet=*sed* (BENGEL). By τὰ ὑστερήματα (Phil. ii. 30; 1 Thess. iii. 10; 1 Cor. xvi. 17; 2 Cor. viii. 13, 14; ix. 12; xi. 9); we

are to understand arrears, which must be cancelled ["deficiencies," ALFORD—R.]; where such are found is indicated by τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ. As in 2 Cor. i. 5 ("the sufferings of Christ") the meaning here is, sufferings which Christ endured.* The Apostle, whom Christ had asked, when he persecuted the Church (Acts ix. 14), "why persecutest thou me?" and who in the Epistle to the Ephesians (i. 22; v. 33; iv. 12) calls Him the Head of the Church, and this His body, could speak thus without fear of being misunderstood. What befalls His own, the Master accepts as done to Himself (Matt. x. 40-42; xxv. 31-46). Hate and persecution He had announced to them beforehand (Jno. xv. 18-21; xvi. 1-4). What the servants suffer is aimed at the Master. He takes it to Himself. All enemies of the Church are His enemies also, who shall be put under His feet (1 Cor. xv. 25). See WINER's *Gram.* p. 178. MELANCHTHON: *non quod ad meritum, quod plenissimum est solius Christi, sed quod ad militiæ societatem attinet.* Here the Apostle treats of historical matters, phenomena and facts, behind which we must ever hold fast to a real, though invisible connexion of the Head with His Church—(here just as in Phil. iii. 10; Rom. viii. 17; 2 Cor. iv. 10 sq.; 2 Tim. ii. 11; 1 Pet. iv. 13)—with respect to the historical development, the course of the Kingdom through the world. There is nothing whatever to indicate atonement with God [*i. e.*, by means of these sufferings of Christ, the "deficiencies" of which Paul was filling up; this interpretation made this "a proof text for the doctrine of indulgences" among the medieval Romanists—it is doubtless thus understood still among them.—R.] As little as τὰ ὑστερήματα describes any lack or insufficiency of afflictions in themselves, so little stress can be laid upon the choice of the specially significant expression (θλίψεις) instead of the more general παθήματα (2 Cor. i. 5). It is incorrect to understand τοῦ Χριστοῦ as meaning: similar to the sufferings of Christ (HUTHER and others), or for the sake of Christ (BÖHMER and others), or borne *auctore et auspice Christo* (LUECKE), or the Church directly. On ἀνταναπληρῶ, placed first on the main idea, BENGEL makes the excellent remark: *fixa est mensura passionum, quas tota exantlare debet ecclesia; quo plus igitur Paulus exhausit, eo minus et ipsi et posthac et ceteris relinquitur; hoc facit communio sanctorum.* While ἀναπληροῦν occurs more frequently in the New Testament, ἀνταναπληροῦν is found here only, and is rare anywhere. The preposition ἀντί, according to the context, refers to a filling up in view of arrears, and marks the extent and weight of the Apostle's sufferings. It cannot be regarded as referring to Christ (instead of Christ, or: as He for me, so I now suffer for Him [*vicissim*]), or to the Church; not even to the fact that he had formerly persecuted Christ and afflicted the Church; although he now as a sufferer completed the sufferings which come on the Church, while as a persecutor he had formerly brought such upon it. TITTMANN (*Syn.* I. p. 230) and WINER (*de verb. comp.* III. p. 22) explain: *alterius quod deficit loco et vice supplere;* not indicated here. [EADIE gives the clearest statement of the various interpretations, and mentions those who uphold them. His own view, which agrees in the main with that of BRAUNE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT,—and of many of the best commentators from CHRYSOSTOM to our day, will appear from the following extracts: "The personal sufferings of Christ are over, but His sufferings in His people still continue. The Apostle in suffering for the sake of the Church, felt that he was filling up the measure of those afflictions. The double compound verb denotes to fill up in relation to; to fill up with something which meets the exigence, or is equivalent to the want. The Apostle filled up the sufferings of Christ not with some foreign agony that had no relation to the defect; but the process of supplement consisted of sufferings which met the deficiency, in quality and amount.—Filled up what was yet wanting in the Saviour's sympathetic sorrows." So Augustine on Psalm lxi.—See Doctrinal notes below.—R.] A further and fuller definition of ἀνταναπληρῶ is given in the next clause: **In my flesh for his body's sake.**—[In support of the above view, WORDSWORTH aptly remarks: "Hence the Apostle says, that I may fill up what is lacking of Christ's sufferings in His *Body;* not in the *Head.*"—R.] The two phrases belong together; "flesh"—"body" denote the reciprocal relation; the former describes the person of the Apostle on the side which is affected by the sorrow (Gal. iv. 4; 2 Cor. iv. 11), the latter the organism to which benefit accrues from the sorrow endured, from the bearing of the sorrow; the individual sacrifice for the whole (MEYER) is the intent of these adverbial phrases. Comp. Eph. iii. 13. STEIGER incorrectly joins these phrases with "the afflictions of Christ as one idea: the verb requires closer definition rather than this. [So ELLICOTT: ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου defines the seat, and inferentially the mode of the "filling up,"—in exquisite contrast (MEYER) with the σῶμα, which defines the *object* of the action.—R.]—**Which is the church,** is simply an explanation (see Eph. i. 22), as ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος ὑμῶν is an explanation of ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.

The ministerial position of Paul. Vers. 25-27.

Ver. 25. **Whereof I became a minister,** ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος.—See ver. 23. This vocation of suffering for the Church he must endure as its minister; as servant, not as master, as servant of the gospel and of the Church, *qui evangelio servit, idem ecclesiæ servit* (GROTIUS). [EADIE: "of which Church;" ELLICOTT: "ἧς has a faintly explanatory force,—'I fill up, *etc.*—the Church, being an appointed

* [MEYER: "Τοῦ Χριστοῦ is a subjective genitive. Paul describes his own sufferings, according to the idea of 'the fellowship of the sufferings of Christ' (1 Pet. iv. 13; comp. Matt. xx. 22; Heb. xiii. 13), as 'the afflictions of Christ.' in case the Apostolic suffering was essentially of the same kind, which Christ had endured (the same cup, of which Christ had drunk, the same baptism, with which Christ had been baptized). The sum of these afflictions is conceived of as a definite measure, as is frequent in classical usage in similar figurative representation.—'I rejoice in my sufferings, which I endure for you, and how great and glorious is that which I am engaged in accomplishing through these sufferings! the full completion of that which is lacking on my part in the fellowship of the sufferings of Christ.' Very naturally his triumphant consciousness, this feeling of the greatness of the matter, led not only to the choice of the highly significant word ἀνταναπληρῶ, but to this description of the Apostle's own afflictions in the most honorable and sublime manner, as the 'afflictions of Christ,' since in their kind and character they are none other than those endured by Christ Himself."—R.]

minister thereof'—in ver. 23 the *διακονία* referred to the *εὐαγγέλιον*, here to the Church by which the *εὐαγγέλιον* is preached"—R.] As servant, which he became: **according to the dispensation of God which was given to me for you.**—Κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ [*gemäss der Haushalterschaft* (stewardship, ALFORD) *Gottes.*—R.] defines his ministry as that of an *οἰκόνομος*, God as *οἰκοδεσπότης*, His (τοῦ θεοῦ) is the *οἰκονομία* entrusted to him, he and his office belong to God. It is therefore the office, not the management, *dispensatio* (Eph. i. 10; iii. 2). [ELLICOTT: "not the *disposition* of God, but the spiritual function, the office of an *οἰκόνομος*." —The word is difficult to render accurately in English. "Dispensation" can remain, not from its fitness, but in lack of a better.—R.] Hence "which was given to me." A comparison of Rom. xv. 15 ("the grace that is given to me of God") with 1 Cor. iii. 10 ("the grace of God which is given unto me") enables us to perceive that the emphasis is laid upon this, that the office, which was given to him, was of God, not that God had given it to him. The expression regards the Church [*Kirche*] as the house of God in connexion with the view that the congregation [*Gemeinde*] is the body of Christ, as in Eph. i. 22 sq. and ii. 21 sq.).—The added phrase, εἰς ὑμᾶς ["for you," "towards you" (ALFORD)—R.], gives the reference, the direction of the office, which God had determined, and takes the readers as denoting, concretely and immediately, the heathen world to which they belonged.

To fulfil the word of God.—This is his allotted duty. The infinitive depends on δοθεῖσαν. [Infinitive of design.—R.] In the object the gospel is included, and thus the idea of a message, which should be carried in all directions. Hence "fulfil" implies the figure of a measure to be filled. BENGEL: *ad omnes perducere. Paulus ubique ad summa tendit.* Comp. Rom. xv. 19. There indeed the locality is given; here it is indicated also by *εἰς ὑμᾶς*, which precedes. Hence it is not=to fulfilling the promises (BEZA), that was not the affair of the Apostle, nor=to proclaim fully in extent and contents (OLSHAUSEN), nor=to preach fully (LUTHER), nor=to complete, as if finish the teaching of Epaphras (FRITZSCHE), nor=to teach as גָּמַר (FLATT, BAEHR and others), nor yet=to realize (STEIGER),=to work out (DE WETTE).=to bring to full faith (CHRYSOSTOM, who connects *εἰς ὑμᾶς* here). [ALFORD seems to incline to the view of Chrysostom, but rejects the assumed connection: "to fulfil the duty of the stewardship, in doing all that this preaching of the word requires." ELLICOTT: "to give its fullest amplitude to, to fill up the measure of its fore-ordained universality, not perhaps without some allusion to the *οἰκονομία*, which could thus be fully discharged." So MEYER and EADIE. See HOMIL. NOTES.—R.]

VER. 26 defines more closely the word of God as to its purport.—**The mystery which hath been hid from the ages and the generations.**—See Eph. iii. 9, 4: i. 9. The synonymous phrase (καὶ—γενεῶν), alone is new, and unique in the New Testament (yet see Eph. iii. 5, 21; Acts xv. 21). Beside the ages of the world, the generations of men living in them are brought into special prominence, and thus the concealment from the beginning of human history is marked. BENGEL incorrectly refers *αἰῶνες* to angels, *γενεαί* to men. [ELLICOTT: "the mystery was the divine purpose of salvation in Christ. and more especially as the context seems to show '*de salvandis gentibus per gratiam evangelicum*' (DAVENANT).—The Apostle does not say, *πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων*, from eternity. The expression is historical. The counsel was *formed πρὸ τ. αἰ.*, but *concealed ἀπο τ. αἰ.*" EADIE seems to be incorrect in limiting "mystery" here to the salvation of the Gentiles, though it has a special reference to this.—R.]

But now is made manifest to his saints.—The Greek liked the transition from a participle to a finite verb, of course with due regard to the structure of the thought, WINER'S *Gram.* p. 505. [Here the transition gives prominence to the second member of the sentence, and sharpens the contrast.—R.] Eph. iii. 5 is parallel. Special emphasis rests upon νυνὶ δέ on account of the antithesis. In contrast with *ἐγνωρίσθη*, which refers to knowledge, and *ἀπεκαλύφθη*, which refers to special spiritual revelation, ἐφανερώθη is the most general and comprehensive expression, certainly not without a reference to the historical actualization, to the fact of evangelical preaching (2 Tim. i. 10). [MEYER observes that this manifestation took place in different ways, partly by revelation, partly by preaching and exposition, and partly by all combined. EADIE and ALFORD seem disposed to limit it to direct manifestation by Divine power, "at the glorification of Christ and the bestowal of the Spirit." But the whole context refers to Paul's ministry, hence the more extensive view, which includes preaching, is to be preferred.—R.] Thus "His saints" means all Christians, and must not be limited to the Apostles on account of the parallel passage (BAEHR, STEIGER, and others). Nor should "saints" be taken indefinitely (HUTHER), because the mystery of the reception of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God was not known by many Jewish Christians. The word is not *ἐγνωρίσθη*, "known;" these were only a minority at best, and their misconception was rather respecting the mode, the immediacy of the entrance of the Gentiles. [DAVENANT applies it to the *elect*, which though true enough, is not pertinent here, see below.—R.]

Ver. 27. **To whom God willed to make known,** οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι.—This relative clause marks the design of God. Ἠθέλησεν* is not to be limited to free grace, as the Greeks and Reformed claim. [CHRYSOSTOM CALVIN, BEZA, DE WETTE—modern commentators, even EADIE, object to pressing such a meaning. ALFORD: a legitimate *inference*, but not an *exposition.*—R.] Simply=it was His will. His

* [Buttman thus distinguishes θέλω and βούλομαι: the former expresses "will combined with choice or purpose," the latter "mere inclinations." Prof. Hitchcock, however, claims (see his valuable note on τοῦ θελήματος, Eph. i. 9) that, in the wide range of volition expressed by θέλω, the element of spontaneity is always included, while βούλομαι always implies deliberation. The former can be used of a brute, the latter of a rational being only (Ammonius). This view, if adopted, would lead to a slight modification of Braune's exegesis, though it would also exclude the limitation to free grace. Perhaps care should be taken in applying the distinction to what is predicated of God.—R.]

design in the "making manifest" was "to make known." Thus the view respecting the former verb is corroborated. The relative clause does not limit the force of ἅγιοι, to those who should know: οἷς is: as to whom, [*quippe quibus* (MEYER): as being persons "to whom," etc. "Seing that to them it was God's will," etc. (ELLICOTT).—R.] The object of γνωρίσαι is: **what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles.**—"What is the riches" is *quæ suit divitiæ* not *quales.* On ὁ and τὸ πλοῦτος, see WINER's *Gram.* p. 64. The Apostle is speaking of the wealth "of the glory of this mystery." Δόξα is the main idea, which must not be weakened: on it depends a "wealth," while it depends "on this mystery," and comes with the revelation of it. Hence it is incorrect to render: "glorious riches" (LUTHER) and *gloriosi hujus mysterii* (BEZA). Δοξα is glory, not to be limited to "bliss" (MICHAELIS), "glorious results" (CHRYSOSTOM), nor yet to be extended to God's Being, His wisdom and grace (DE WETTE), the Divine self-revelation (SCHENKEL). CALVIN is excellent: "He teaches that these riches had appeared, particularly among the Gentiles; for what could be more deserving of admiration, than that the Gentiles, who for so many ages had been sunk in death, and whose condition might seem altogether desperate, should suddenly be received into the ıamily of God, and receive the inheritance of salvation?" [On the meaning of δόξα, see ALFORD and ELLICOTT. —The former, following MEYER, makes it identical with δόξα below—the latter distinguishes it, more correctly. Both would not restrict it to either a subjective or objective meaning; it partakes of both.—R.] On this account "among the Gentiles," is to be joined with "is," which must be supplied, not to "this mystery." Among the Gentiles the riches of the glory of this mystery revealed in the gospel appeared in the sharpest contrast with the deepest shadows (OLSHAUSEN).

Two phrases in apposition make the sense clearer. *First:* **which** [or **who**] **is Christ in you,** [*bei Euch,* "among you—R.]—"Christ among the Gentiles, the greatest paradox in that age" (BENGEL). First "without Christ," "without God." "Children of wrath by nature" (Eph. ii. 12, 13) now He is among, in them (Eph. iii. 17). 'Εν ὑμῖν corresponds to ἐν ἔθνεσιν, "Christ" to "the riches of the glory of this mystery," and ὅς marks this reference, though it conforms to the following name, not to τὸ πλοῦτος (WINER's *Gram.* p. 157). [Hence the various readings do not affect the sense.—R.] The reference to "this mystery" (HUTHER) [ALFORD, ELLICOTT.—R.] is too restricted, and not well-founded in grammar or fact. By "Christ" we must understand not the knowledge of Christ (THEOPHYLACT), nor the doctrine of Christ (GROTIUS) nor yet "from Christ" (FLATT), but Himself, His Person. "You" means the Gentiles, not simply the Colossian readers, as in ver. 25.—*Secondly:* **the hope of glory,** in exegetical apposition with "Christ," in whom the Gentiles have the surety for the future fruition of the glory of salvation: in Him we have here as seed, what we shall have in Him there as harvest. Entirely like 1 Tim. i. 1, "Jesus Christ, our hope." ["Glory" here is future blessedness, above it has a more general reference, see EADIE, ELLICOTT.—R.] "Christ—your life," iii. 4, is similar. Jno. xi. 25. Comp. Eph. i. 18; ii. 12; Rom. viii. 24. BENGEL: *Christus in nobis, per se lætissimum; sed multo lætius, respectu eorum, quæ revelabuntur.*

Paul's labor. Vers. 28, 29. **Whom we preach,** ὃν ἡμεῖς καταγγέλλομεν.—The emphasis must be laid on ἡμεῖς, which might be wanting, did not the Apostle speak in opposition to false teachers. At the same time, he notes that he does not stand alone. It does not refer directly to Timothy (MEYER), nor to Epaphras; it is doubtful whether Paul thought of particular persons. Certainly BLEEK is mistaken in his view that he thought particularly of no other one than himself. [So CONYBEARE, who insists ever upon the singular force of ἡμεῖς.—R.] The singular which follows (ver. 29: κοπιῶ) forbids such an opinion. ERASMUS incorrectly places the emphasis upon ὅν; "this one, not Moses or angels."

Warning every man and teaching every man.—This gives the modality of the καταγγελεῖν. Both participles [νουθετοῦντες and διδάσκοντες] are used, iii. 16, in another order. The first aims to affect the will, using what is already known, the other to foster knowledge, beginning indeed with what is known; it denotes the imparting of information, linked with what is known, or the extension and deepening of knowledge, and here indeed, in the second place after νουθετοῦντες, on the basis of experiences and occurrences in the present and past, with a view to the future and eternity. Eph. vi. 4; Acts xxvi. 18; Rom. iii. 23–26. Both embrace repentance and faith—not the first participle the former, and the second, the latter (MEYER). [So ELLICOTT, and ALFORD, "but not too closely or exclusively."—R.] Nor is the first alone moral, and the second only didactic (SCHENKEL). BENGEL too is incorrect, νουθετοῦνται, *qui jam docti sunt,* διδάσκονται, *rudes.* [For the other views, see EADIE, who, while regarding the first term as the more general, and the second as the more special,—agrees in the main with BRAUNE's view as given above.—R.] Both are more closely defined: **in all wisdom,** ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ.—See Eph. i. 8. There is no reason for joining it to διδάσκοντες alone, (DE WETTE, MEYER) [ALFORD, ELLICOTT and apparently EADIE.—R.], and the view is a perversion, which finds in it the object of the instruction (ESTIUS and others). "Wisdom of words" (1 Cor. i. 11; ii. 1–4) is excluded, but insight into the individuality of one to be taught and admonished, into his condition, and into the method by which it can be successfully done. [ALFORD: "the method of teaching." ELLICOTT: "in every form of wisdom—the characteristic element in which the teaching was always to be, and to which it was to be circumscribed." CHRYSOSTOM: μετὰ πάσης σοφίας. These views are correct, but should be extended to "warning" as well.—R.]

That we may present every man perfect in Christ.—Ἵνα gives the end of the "preaching," mediated by the "warning" and "teaching." As in ver. 22, παραστήσωμεν, which is placed first for emphasis, is used with

reference to the Judgment; so earnest a matter is it; it has not to do with men's judgment. The offering of a sacrifice is not found in the context. "Every man" is repeated for the third time: every individual the Apostle bore on his heart. BENGEL: *hoc toties positum maximan habet δεινότητα ac vim, et causam continet, cur etiam ad ignotos scribat.* As "perfect" each should there appear, and indeed, as the context and ver. 22 require, in his whole being, not simply in knowledge (CHRYSOSTOM [CALVIN] and others), or in justifying faith (OLSHAUSEN). Perfection is possible only "in Christ," who alone conditions and effects this, in life and nature. By this he excludes all those false methods of voluntary asceticism, to which the false teachers guided. [Such a reference is considered doubtful by ALFORD and ELLICOTT, "in Christ" being so frequently used by the Apostle.—R.]

Ver. 29. **Whereunto I also labour.**—["To which end."—R.] The proclamation of Christ is the Apostle's life-work (εἰς ὅ) and not simply a service, and also (καί) a painful labor (κοπιῶ). [Καί, also; besides preaching, etc.—I labor also. The relapse to the singular—"has an individualizing force, and carries on the reader from the general and common labors of preaching the gospel, to the struggles of the individual preacher" (ELLICOTT).—R.] This is strengthened by **striving**, ἀγωνιζόμενος.—By this he means both the *internal* conflicts of soul (iv. 12; ii. 1 sq.) in care, prayer, sympathy and earnestness for sanctification, and the *external* "fightings" (1 Tim. iv. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 2; Phil. i. 30). CHRYSOSTOM adds *μετὰ πολλῆς σπουδῆς τουτέστιν μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἀγρυπνίας.* MEYER [EADIE, ALFORD.—R.] incorrectly limit it to internal, GROTIUS, BAEHR and others to external conflict.

According to his working, which worketh in me mightily.—"According to his working" (ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ according to the context: Christ's) denotes, that Paul is not led and limited to his own strength, but strives according to the measure of the energy of Christ, which too worketh mightily in him, Eph. iii. 20, Phil. iv. 13. *Paulus per se non valeret, pro eo ac Christus in eo operatur, pellet* (BENGEL). It is both humility and certainty of victory. As little as *αὐτοῦ* should be considered as referring to God (CHRYSOSTOM and others), so little is the participle to be taken as passive (ESTIUS) and ἐν δυνάμει (comp. Rom. i. 4) to be referred to miracles (VATABLE). [ELLICOTT, quoting CALVIN, thinks there is no reason for excluding miracles summarily, though he admits such a reference would be only secondary. EADIE makes the phrase specify "the mode of operation." "The occurrence of the noun and a correlate verb intensifies the meaning"—Such a "working" would be "in power." "Its ample energies clothed him with a species of moral omnipotence."—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The sufferings of the Church are the sufferings of Christ.* The connexion of Christ, as Lord and Head, with the Church, His Body is so close, that the sufferings of the Church are the sufferings of Christ. "We know that the unity of the head and the members is such, that the name *Christ* sometimes comprehends the whole body" (CALVIN). "The head feels pain before the other members: thus experience teaches. For if you tread on a man's little toe, or hurt any other one of the most insignificant members, you notice it at once in his countenance. So Christ, our Head, takes the pains of us, His members, as if they were His own, and it burdens Him, as though it befell Himself, when any sorrow meets us" (LUTHER). [WORDSWORTH quotes Augustine on Ps. lxi., as follows: "Jesus Christ is one Man with His Body and His Head; the Saviour of the Body and the members of the Body are twain in one flesh; they are one in *suffering*, and when the iniquity of the world is past, they will be one in *rest.* Therefore the sufferings of Christ are not limited to Christ; nay, rather the sufferings of Christ are not except in Christ. For if you understand Christ to be both Head and Body, the sufferings of Christ are all in Christ. Hence the Apostle says '*Ut suppleam quod desunt pressurarum Christi in carne meâ.*' Whosoever therefore thou art, if thou art a member of Christ, whatsoever thou sufferest, was lacking to the sufferings of Christ. Therefore that suffering of thine is added because it was lacking; thou art filling the measure, not making it flow over. Thou sufferest so much in thyself as was to be poured in the universal passion of Christ, who suffered in our Head, and who suffers in His members, that is, in us. The whole measure of suffering will not be filled up till the world comes to an end."—R.] Two opinions present themselves here in opposition at either extreme: That of MEYER, that persecutions are indeed *directed* against Christ, but He, the victorious Ruler in Glory, cannot be *passively affected* by them; and SCHENKEL'S, that He, as Head of His Body, must even now *share its feelings.* The former view sunders them, and makes of Christ's sympathy a mere phrase; the latter so confounds them in one, that the sympathy of Christ is marred and soiled by the susceptibility of the militant Church, instead of this being alleviated, purified and exalted by that.

2. *The atoning and the enduring sufferings of Christ.* A distinction must be made between the sufferings of Christ, which *atone for sin* and *extirpate* its *corruption*, and those which *endure sin* and its *evils.* The former, which He vicariously and representatively bore for us, are not here spoken of. The Romanists (CAJETAN, BELLARMINE, and others) are in error, in referring this passage to these only, and then regarding Paul's sufferings as supplementary to those of Christ, and hence, as also atoning and substitutionary, founding upon this their dogma of a storehouse of *superfluous good works* and *indulgences.* According to Jno. xix. 30, "It is finished," Christ's propitiatory sufferings need no supplement and completion; neither do His sufferings remove merely the guilt of original sin, nor is atonement for sins after baptism to be sought through the saints; one needing redemption himself, cannot make atonement. [For authorities on both sides of this controversy, consult the notes of EADIE, ALFORD and WORDSWORTH.—R.] This passage does not speak of those redeeming sufferings, of the sufferings of Christ in the theological, doctrinal sense, but in the *historical* sense, of the

sufferings of Christ in the world, of the sufferings of His Church from the world. These have a sum and extent not yet concluded, which are diminished in the onward progress to final victory, so that what the world, exhausting itself in its enmity, does to the members of Christ, turns out to the advantage of the Church, in so far as these members bear and forbear in the fellowship of their exalted Lord, the victor who sympathizes with triumphant sympathy. It is by just such *suffering heroes* in the Church, that she is helped out of manifold sorrow.

3. The *Word of God* is, as to its *nature, revelation* of a mystery, which would otherwise have been hidden from men, as to its tenor, *testimony* respecting Christ for all men. And this tenor is *universal*, directed to all men, is *mediated* by the proclamation of historical facts, *begins* within the man, and reaches beyond the germs and conflicts of time into perfection in eternity.

4. The *ministry of the Word* is an ordinance of God in and for the Church He has formed. It pre-supposes the revelation of Christ in the world, in the history of humanity, has to do with the proving of the same for each and every one by means of a proclamation, which takes hold of and advances the whole man, morally and intellectually, in will and knowledge. It should preserve, as its end, the internal sanctification and perfection unto the final Judgment, and is conditioned by the personal labors of the minister, as Christ's energy in him.

5. *Special care for Souls* is very important ["every man"—R]. It begins with Christ's special care.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The Christian has to be thankful for so many and so great things, which he cannot lose, that in the sorrows of time, with the prospect of eternity and bliss, he is not joyless, but should be constantly rejoicing.—The Christian may rejoice, where men rejoice, and *can* rejoice, where it is impossible for men. He can rejoice, when he has his child in his arms,—and over its bier also. It is a great mistake to suppose that a certain melancholy and restraint of lively emotion is joined with Christian faith and piety.—Christian joy is the echo of a higher joy, which drowns the tumult of earthly sorrow.—The springs of joy in Mount Zion and Calvary cause it to flow on without interruption, and inexhaustibly.—The Christian's sorrow can and will bring good to the whole body and cause of Christ: in this the world's enmity but wearies and exhausts itself, to make the Christian come forth ever brighter.—The minister of the Word labors with the Eternal on the Eternal, for eternity, more than the artist; but only when He who has contrived eternal Redemption, works upon him, and he does not resist Him.

STARKE:—Preachers are not lords of the faith, but servants of the church, who have to direct all their service to the edification of the church.—The gospel is indeed made known to all the world, but is *known* in its truth and power only by those, who let themselves be brought thereby to faith.—Christ is in His believers, and this is the greatest mystery.—If many a teacher did not interlard his discourses with uncertain stories, fables, figures and other things of human wisdom, they would sink deeper into the hearts of men.

RIEGER:—The joy of the Apostles amid their sufferings was a fruit of the sorrow of Jesus under His. In our sufferings there must often be revealed to us, amid fear and sorrow, the weakness of our flesh, but often also, amid great peace and conscious joy, the manifold power of God and His Spirit of glory. Both are wholesome. Let one force or affect nothing, but accept what and as God finds it necessary.—One must so serve the church, that the gospel be derogated in no respect; yet one must not, under the pretext of the gospel, lord it over the people, but be a helper of their joy.

GERLACH:—In a few significant words the Apostle here brings to our view the activity of a genuine preacher of the gospel; 1) he preaches the mystery of the grace of God in Christ; 2) he admonishes all sinners to repentance; 3) he instructs even the plainest, poorest, most ignorant men; 4) he seeks to guide all to perfection, will withhold the higher light and life from none, keep none in a lower grade, is never satisfied with himself, nor permits himself to be satisfied with the state of others; 5) is ever conscious that a life of labor, especially of conflict too, is allotted to him; and 6) in this life confides only in the power of God working in him mightily, which is promised him, and hence gives God the glory for all.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—He could compare his sufferings with the sufferings of Christ, because they too had their cause in the antagonism of men to the preaching, which Christ had begun, and because to him they also were a work of obedience. Now too there are more views of Redemption, more representations of the manner of the liberty of the Sons of God, and yet there is ever more to be revealed of this mystery.

HEUBNER:—Suffering for atonement, Christ alone and fully bore; but suffering for our preservation and for the extension of the kingdom of Christ, every Christian must bear; since Christ has left a share to each.—The gospel sermon is a universal enlistment of souls for Christ. No man is too bad. Empty and hungry souls are led to Him, with Him to be satisfied and sanctified.

PASSAVANT:—"I do not fear the crowd of men, nor the angry outbreak of the world," wrote Matamoras, the Spanish martyr (November, 1862), from his prison in Granada; "as a Christian I have strength enough to lift myself above the raging torrent of earthly anger;—not through my own might, through my own powers, no, but through the strength our loving Father bestows upon me in Jesus; through Jesus, who is my Shield, an impenetrable shield, against which the whole world is weak."—Among the poor heathen of those times as of ours, could be seen only ignorance, hollow deceits, brilliant errors and lies; crying, devilish sins and proud vices raged among the refined Greeks and the proud men in all classes of the spoiled people. The light, or the uncertain, distorted ray of a former light, was limited to the narrow circle of nobler minds; the yet beautiful, rare fragments of the shattered truth remained a private possession of their pupils: the more lovely souls in every na

tion had only the uncertain legends of the poets as a solace: the priestly utterances, the arbitrary wisdom of the sage, as light on the path of life to death; many, perhaps very many sought salvation and peace at the dumb altar of "the unknown god."—The mystery since then has been made known to myriads of myriads; yet only the smaller part have comprehended it; to the saints alone has it been revealed in their hearts.—Without this "Christ in us" all hope beyond earth is but empty fancy, vanity and delusion; Christ among us and the clearness of His heavenly kingdom about us, only an unknown foreign land into which we have no desire to enter. Then our Christianity is but a borrowed, beautiful garment, which neither fits us nor hides our nakedness.

[SCHENKEL:—Ver. 24. The joy of the Christian in sorrow: 1) Its ground; 2) Its kind.—The blessing of persecution for the church of the Lord: 1) wherein it consists; 2) whereon it rests.—Ver 27. Christ lives among us: 1) A mystery to the unbeliever; 2) the comfort and joy of all believers.—Ver. 28. The task of the evangelical sermon: 1) as to its contents; to warn and to teach; 2) as to its form; "every man in all wisdom;" 3) as to its end; to "present every man perfect in Christ."—Ver. 29. The duty of the evangelical preacher: 1) wherein it consists—in labors and striving; 2) whereby its fulfilment becomes possible—through the help and power of Christ.—R.]

[BURKITT:—Such as are eminent in the church, and, as ministers of the gospel, do lay out themselves more abundantly in the church's service, must expect to meet with a measure, and a full measure of suffering beyond others.—Observe the subject, the manner, the end of St. Paul's preaching. Also his pains and diligence; the gracious help and blessed success he had, humbly and thankfully acknowledged, and ascribed to God.—R.]

[HENRY:—The preaching of redemption 1. to whom it was preached (ver. 23), 2. by whom it was preached. 1) Whence Paul had his ministry (ver. 26); 2) for whose sake he has his ministry (ver. 25); 3) what kind of a preacher Paul was; a suffering preacher (ver. 24), a close preacher (ver. 28), a laborious preacher (ver. 29). 3. The gospel which was preached (ver. 26, 27). 1) A mystery long hidden, 2) now made manifest to the saints.—The meanest saint under the gospel understands more than the greatest prophets under the law.—The ground of our hope is Christ in the word, or the gospel revelation, declaring the nature and methods of obtaining it. The evidence of our hope is Christ in the heart, or the sanctification of the soul and its preparation for the heavenly glory.—R.]

[EADIE:—In the Divine arrangement of the spiritual house, the Apostle held a function which had special reference to the members of the gentile churches. He would not be confined within the narrow circuit of Judaism; the field on which his soul set itself was the world.—The Apostle says of himself that he did not preach, but that he fulfilled the gospel. He carried out its design—he did not narrow its purpose—he opened for it a sweep and circuit adapted to its magnificence of aim, and its universality of fitness and sufficiency. As an instrument of human regeneration, he brought it to perfection.—The glory of Christians is yet to come, but it is certain. Such glory is too bright for earth, and is therefore to be enjoyed in a scene which shall be in harmony with it. Christ is the hope of this glory.—The process of sanctification begets at once the idea and the hope of perfection.—The apostolic preaching was precise and definite. The one theme was Christ, "Him first, Him last, Him midst." Not simply His doctrine, but Himself.—What in other spheres is enthusiasm, in the Christian ministry is sobriety.—The sublime motive to present every man perfect in Christ, through the preaching of Christ, could only be realized by the conferment of Divine qualification and assistance.—BARNES:—In such a work it is a privilege to exhaust our strength; in the performance of the duties of such an office, it is an honor to be permitted to wear out life itself. Doing this, a man when he comes to die will feel that he has not lived in vain.—R.]

4. Anxiety of the Apostle about their being led away by false wisdom.

(Chap. II. 1–15.)

1 For I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for[1] you and *for* them at
2 Laodicea, and *for* as many as have not seen[2] my face in the flesh; that their
hearts might be comforted, being knit together[3] in love, and unto all riches[4] of the
full assurance [lit., of the fulness of assurance] of understanding, to the acknowledg-
ment [full knowledge] of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ
3 [or omit all after God],[5] in whom [or which] are hid all the treasures of wisdom and
4 knowledge. And this I say, lest any man [that no one, μηδείς][6] should beguile you
5 with enticing words. For though I be absent in the flesh, yet I am with you in
the spirit, joying and beholding your order, and the steadfastness [firm foundation]
6 of your faith in Christ. As ye have therefore [or As then ye have] received Christ
7 Jesus the Lord, *so* walk [walk] ye in him; rooted and built up in him, and estab-
lished in the faith [or by faith],[7] as ye have been taught, abounding therein[8] with
8 thanksgiving. Beware lest any man spoil you [lit., lest there shall be any one that
maketh you his booty][9] through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of
9 men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For [Because] in him
10 dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete [made full,
11 πεπληρωμένοι] in him, which [who][10] is the head of all principality and power: in
whom also ye are [ye also were] circumcised with the [a, article wanting] circumci-
sion made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins [omit of the sins][11] of
12 the flesh, by [in, ἐν] the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism,
wherein [or in whom][12] also ye are risen with *him* [were raised] with *him* [or to-
gether] through the faith of [in] the operation of God, who hath raised him from
13 the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh,
[insert you][13] hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you [us][14] all
14 trespasses; blotting [having blotted] out the handwriting of ordinances that was
against us, which was contrary to us, and took [he has taken, ἦρκεν][15] it out of the
15 way, nailing [by nailing][16] it to his cross: *and* having spoiled principalities and
powers, he made a shew of them openly [with boldness],[17] triumphing over them
in it.

[1] Ver. 1.—Περὶ ὑμῶν is to be preferred as the more difficult reading to ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν which ℵ. A. B. C. read, probably taken from i. 24. [The authorities are as follows: περί, D.[1] D.[3] E. F. G. K. L., most cursives, Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott, Eadie, Wordsworth; ὑπέρ, ℵ. A. B. C. D.[2] Lachmann, Alford. Retaining the former, "for"="about".—R.]

[2] Ver. 1.—['Εώρακαν (an Alexandrian form of the perfect) is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer and later English editors on the authority of ℵ. A. B. C. and others.—R.]

[3] Ver. 2.—[Instead of συμβιβασθέντων. (Rec., grammatical emendation, uncial authority slight) συμβιβασθέντες is well sustained, adopted by all modern editors.—R.]

[4] Ver. 2.—[Instead of πάντα πλοῦτον, (Rec.) modern editors adopt one of two readings; πᾶν τὸ πλοῦτος, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott, Wordsworth: πᾶν πλοῦτος. Alford on the authority of ℵ.[1] B. The former is preferable as it accounts of the reading πάντα, το being changed to τα. The neuter form has a distinct meaning.—R.]

[5] Ver. 2.—Τοῦ θεοῦ is found in several cursive manuscripts which usually agree with B. To this B. adds: χριστοῦ [adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, ed. 1, Meyer, Huther, Wordsworth, Tregelles, Ellicott, "with considerable confidence."—R.] ℵ. adds πατρὸς χριστοῦ; a later hand: καὶ πατρὸς τοῦ χριστοῦ; A. C. insert πατρὸς τοῦ χριστοῦ; some cursive manuscripts and versions: πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ; Rec. with E. K. L. καὶ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ. We find besides ἐν χριστῷ and ὅ ἐστιν χριστός. See Exeg. Notes. [Amid so great variety, we may yet conclude, 1. that the longer reading of Rec., followed by E. V., is not the true reading. 2. That the simplest explanation of the great variety is, the original text was the shorter τοῦ θεοῦ, the rest being glosses. So Braune, Tischendorf, ed. 2. 7. De Wette, Alford and many others. But 3, this reading having no uncial support, there remains a strong doubt in favor of another one of the many. Of these the most probable as well as best supported is that of B., τοῦ θεοῦ χριστοῦ. For a defence of the former, see Alford, who confesses his inability to fix the reading on any external authority; of the latter, Meyer, Ellicott, and the editors they respectively quote. The rendering, in case the latter be adopted, is still doubtful; either "of God, Christ" or "of God, even Christ" *i. e.*, Christ in apposition with "mystery." See Exeg. Notes.—R.]

[6] Ver. 4.—ℵ. A. B. C. D. and others have μηδείς, [Tischendorf and modern editors generally.—R.]; better supported than μήτις, [Rec.—The above reading indicates stronger probability of their being deceived.—R.]

[7] Ver. 7.—Τῇ πίστει. B. D. [Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Ellicott.—R.] ℵ. and many others insert ἐν [Rec. Wordsworth—R.], which seems to have been taken from the foregoing context. [The simple dative may be either instrumental, Braune, Meyer—"by faith," or of reference, Alford, Ellicott. See Exeg. Notes.—R.]

[8] Ver. 7.—'Εν αὐτῇ is to be retained with B. [D.[3] E. K. L. Tischendorf, ed. 7, Lachmann, Meyer, Ellicott, Wordsworth.—R.] It is wanting in ℵ. but ἐν αὐτῷ is added by a later hand.

[9] Ver. 8—[The E. V. is too condensed. "You" is emphatic, the more so, as the correct reading seems to be τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται, B. K. L. Rec., Tischendorf, ed. 7, Meyer, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth. Not ἔσται ὑμᾶς, Lachmann, Braune apparently.—R.]

[10] Ver. 10.—[Ὅς is the reading of ℵ. A. C. K. L., Rec. Tischendorf, Meyer and others. ὅ, B. D. E. F. G. Lachmann "Which," E. V., stands here for "who."—R.]

[11] Ver. 11.—[Τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν of the Rec. is generally rejected as an explanatory gloss. Uncial authority very slight.—R.]

[12] Ver. 12.—[Ἐν ᾧ may mean "wherein" or "in whom." If the latter be adopted, read "risen together" instead of "with Him." See Exeg. Notes;—βαπτίσματα is to be retained with most authorities and editors, instead of βαπτισμῷ, Alford.—R.]

[13] Ver. 13.—Ὑμᾶς is to be retained with ℵ. [A. C. K. L., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth.—R.] B. has ἡμᾶς. Some [Rec. D. F.] omit both as unnecessary.

[14] Ver. 13.—[Ὑμῖν of the Rec. is not well supported, Wordsworth retains it; ἡμῖν. ℵ. A. B. C. D. F. K., Tischendorf and most modern writers Ellicott says: "Both external and internal arguments suggest the more inclusive ἡμῖν."—R].

[15] Ver. 14.—[The perfect should be retained by rendering "hath taken," so Tyndale, Coverdale and other versions.—R.]

[16] Ver. 14.—["By nailing" preserves the modal force as well as the relation of time implied in προσηλώσας.—R.]

[17] Ver. 15.—[This alteration is the only one required to make the English text harmonize with Braune's exegesis. The various renderings that are substituted for "spoiled," as well as the marginal reading of the E. V., "in him" for "in it," are discussed in the Exeg. Notes.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Winning exordium full of tender concern for the spiritual health of the Church. Vers. 1–3.*

Ver. 1. **For I would that ye knew** (1 Cor. xi. 3; Phil. i. 12; Rom. xi. 25).—"For" links this to the foregoing, and according to the context, to "striving" (i. 29); with good reason did he speak of conflicts in this Epistle, since he was anxious about the Colossians also.

What great conflict I have for you.—Ἡλίκον (only in Jas. iii. 5, where it is used twice of little fire and great wood), derived from ἧλιξ (one of the same age, a companion), describes the manner, the vehemence and importance rather than the extent (Meyer and others), as πηλίκοις (Gal. vi. 11 †)=*qualibus*. Hesychius: ποδαπόν, ὁποῖον. [Ellicott: qualitative adjective.—R.] Ἀγῶνα ἔχω denotes the continuance of his anxiety. [Eadie: "intense and painful anxiety." Any reference to outward sufferings (Ellicott) is very doubtful.—R.] Περὶ ὑμῶν indicates the readers as the object; what is more prominent in ὑπέρ, viz., for their benefit, is put in the back ground. **And them at Laodicea** adds a neighboring church in the same situation (see Introd. § 4.).

And as many as have not seen my face in the flesh.—On ἑώρακαν (see Winer's *Gram.* p. 73). Ver. 2: αὐτῶν, requires us to understand this of persons belonging together and grouped together. It is improper to imply it either to those unknown to Paul in other places, in contrast with those in Colosse and Laodicea (Theodoret, Schultz in *Stud. und Krit.*, 1829, p. 135 sq.), Paul having been in both places, or to those Colossians and Laodiceans who remained unknown to him (Rohr, Wiggers). Paul merely adds a category for his readers; they had not seen him. [Alford: καί is not copulative, but generalizing. See his remarks on the grammatical inference that Paul had not been at Colosse—so most modern editors.—Wordsworth is decided in favor of the other view, following Theodoret. The passage so naturally suggests the thought that Paul had not been there, as to require far stronger evidence than has yet been adduced to sustain any other view.—R.] He adds to πρόσωπόν μου (1 Thess. ii. 17; iii. 10) ἐν σαρκί, since the contrast between spiritual presence and lack of personal acquaintanceship (ver. 5) readily suggested this concrete strengthening (bodily face). The reason for it is not to be found in the spiritual physiognomy (Olshausen). nor is it to be joined with ἑώρακαν (Chrysostom and others). It marks rather, that the readers need not be surprised at the Apostle's concern, when they did not know each other, that he included all Christians, known and unknown, in his sympathy as brethren, than that the motive of his concern was the fact of his not having himself founded and instructed this Church (Schenkel), or his having only an uncertain idea of it (Bleek). Bengel: *Paulus se omnium gentium debitorum statuit.*

Ver. 2. **That their hearts might be comforted.**—This is the purpose of the conflict (ἵνα). The verb means accurately, "to call upon," then "to admonish" (Phil. iv. 2), "to entreat" (Philem. 10), [rendered "beseech" in both cases in E. V.—R.], "to comfort" (2 Cor. i. 4), so that trust, confidence, strength is there, not doubt, uncertainty, wavering (iv. 8· Eph. vi. 22); hence also "to strengthen, confirm" (Jas. iv. 3; Isa. xxxv. 3). [Alford insists that the idea of confirming predominates here. But Meyer, Eadie, Ellicott agree in upholding the usual meaning —R.] The Apostle regards the danger from false teachers as misfortune, affliction (Chrysostom: οὔτε κατηγορῶν οὔτε ἀπαλλάττων αὐτοὺς κατηγορίας). This comfort and tranquillity should first affect the heart, the centre.—**Being knit together in love.**—Συμβιβασθέντες according to the sense, as though it were αὐτοί, iii. 16; Eph. iv. 2, 3, Winer's *Gram.* p. 532. On the meaning, comp. ii. 19; Eph. iv. 16. The participle denotes the way, the mode of the comfort; union in love according to the context: *in amore fidelium mutuo*, brotherly love, as the ethical element (Meyer) in which the "knitting together" was consummated. The Vulgate (*instructi*) is incorrect, and Luther also: comprehended (coördinate to "comforted").

And unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the full knowledge of the mystery of God [even Christ

* ["From the construction of this Exordium I venture to assert, that there is no rule laid down by Aristotle, Cicero, and other masters of eloquence, concerning the framing of introductions, which is not adhered to in this brief opening. For three things are required of them in a legitimate Exordium: That it be adopted to render the hearer *attentive*, and *docile*, and to *conciliate his affection*." Davenant.—R.]

† [The meaning of πηλίκοις (Gal. vi. 11) has been much discussed. See *in loco*. It is very doubtful whether *qualibus* is strictly correct.—R.]

ELLICOTT. **God Christ**, WORDSWORTH.—R.]—*Καί* joins coördinately the end (*εἰς*) of the union, and in a two-fold direction; formally and quantitatively, "all riches of the fulness of assurance of understanding," materially and qualitatively, "to the full knowledge of the mystery of God." It is not sufficient to maintain, to know individual matters, the understanding must extend to the whole, in its fulness, and must attain to knowledge of the mystery. Comp. i. 9; Eph. iii. 18; in fellowship we advance to full knowledge.—On *πληροφορία*, see 1 Thess. i. 5; Heb. vi. 11; x. 22; it denotes full conviction, excludes incompleteness, includes joyous self-certainty. [EADIE: "the fixed persuasion that you comprehend the truth, and that it is the truth which you comprehend." What is commonly termed "assurance of knowledge," rather than "assurance of faith."—R.]—On "the mystery of God" see Eph. i. 9. If *Χριστοῦ* is inserted, this could not be regarded as dependent on *θεοῦ* (against HUTHER, MEYER, SCHENKEL), since the article is wanting, and every clear ground for it in the text, but only as in apposition to *θεοῦ*, so that Christ is called God, a singularity which is not Pauline, notwithstanding Rom. ix. 5; Eph. v. 5; Tit. ii. 13 (against STEIGER)—nor is it in apposition to *μυστηρίου*, as a gloss indicates. [Rejecting the reading of the Rec. as untenable, but one other than the shortest, has a claim upon our attention, the one referred to above: *τοῦ θεοῦ Χριστοῦ*. Braune refers to the three interpretations suggested. The first: the "mystery of the God of Christ," is harsh, as well as open to the grammatical objection he urges. The second is defended by WORDSWORTH, following HILARY: "the mystery of the God Christ," *i. e.* the mystery of the Divine nature of the Man Christ Jesus. His notes are worthy of attention. The third, making *Χριστοῦ* in apposition with *μυστηρίου* seems far preferable: "the mystery of God, even Christ."—It is well supported by ELLICOTT, and the gloss above referred to (*ὅ ἐστιν Χριστός*), is not without weight in determining the reading and the interpretation. Even MEYER, in adopting the interpretation "the mystery of the God of Christ," says: *In Christ* God has comprehended and consummated the decree of Redemption (the *μυστήριον*). To him who has acknowledged God as the *God of Christ*, the divine mystery is thereby revealed." Of course the meaning of *μυστήριον* is widely extended by taking Ellicott's view. It includes not simply the mystery of the Incarnation, but also of Redemption as involved in the Incarnation. The next verse can certainly be interpreted more readily, if this view be accepted.—R.]

Ver. 3. **In which**—*Ἐν ᾧ* refers to *μυστηρίου*. [E. V., "in whom"—(with the marginal reading "wherein,") refers it to Christ. If *Χριστοῦ* is retained above, and then taken in apposition to *μυστηρίου*, the meaning is the same. Unless the reference be to Christ in some direct way, it seems scarcely likely that Paul would say that in it were "hid *all* the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." So wide a predicate is best applied to Christ.—R.]—**Are.**—*Εἰσίν* stands first for emphasis, to lay stress upon the fact that in God all mysteries are actually present.—**All the treasures of wisdom and knowledge**, *πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ τῆς γνώσεως*.—*Σοφία* is the practical wisdom, to which every Christian attains, *γνῶσις* is the dialectic science, which is found only in a mentally gifted and cultivated Christian. [*Σοφία*, the more general, *γνῶσις*, the more special, MEYER, EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT.—R.] CALVIN is incorrect: *duplicatio ad augendum valet.* BENGEL: *θησαυροί, hinc πλοῦτος, σοφία hinc σύνεσις, γνῶσις hinc ἐπίγνωσις.* Hence the mystery must needs be revealed for the treasures are **hid**, *ἀπόκρυφοι*, in it. The adjective is a closer definition of the existence of the treasures in the mystery, and not a description of the treasures in themselves, therefore not an attributive joined to *θησαυροί* (BENGEL, MEYER, SCHENKEL). [ALFORD defends most fully the interpretation: "the secret treasures." EADIE upholds the view not noticed by Braune, that the treasures are "laid up." ELLICOTT, whose notes here are valuable, makes it a "secondary predicate of manner," *i. e.*, the treasures, *etc.*, *are* in the mystery or in Christ, they are so *suddenly;* until revealed and made the object of "full knowledge" as above (ver. 2). This recognizes the emphatic position of the verb, takes the adjective in its natural meaning, and accords better with the context. It seems to be Braune's view. DAVIES refers to the *gnostical* stamp of the terms in this verse. There is probably an allusion to the false doctrine at Colosse.—R.] The church did not need another system of doctrine, only more profound exposition.*

Brief sketch of the Situation. Vers. 4, 5.

Ver. 4. **And this I say**, refers to vers. 1–3, not to ver. 3 alone (ŒKUMEN, CALVIN, BAEHR and others). In ver. 5 he proves his *λέγω* by his sympathy. The danger which environs his readers, on account of which he cannot be silent, corresponds with his inward conflict about and for them: **that no one should beguile you.**—The verb (*παραλογίζηται*, only here and Jas. i. 22,) denotes, through *παρα*, as in *παραβαίνω*, *παράδοξος*, a deviation, violation, of the *λόγος*, the *λογίζεσθαι*, to miscalculate, to be deceived through sophisms (PASSOW, *sub voce*).

With enticing words, *ἐν πιθανολογίᾳ* denotes especially the danger. *Πιθανός* means "adapted to convince, persuading," like *πειθός*, and *λογια* denotes the mode in which this skill appears, viz.: in speech; it is stronger than *ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις* (1 Cor. ii. 4); it is found here only and *in malam partem.* LUTHER is incorrect—"with rational speech." The formal side of the false doctrine, the sophistical, rhetorical, insinuating method is noted, there is nothing from which the purport of the false doctrine can be inferred. [ELLICOTT: "the preposition *ἐν* has that species of instrumental force, in which the object is conceived as existing in the means," rather than indicating merely "the element in which the deceit works" (ALFORD).—R.]

Ver. 6. **For though I be absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit.**—Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 5. External, bodily absence, and spiritual presence, strongly marked by *σὺν ὑμῖν*, are here contrasted. There is no hint

* [In view of the errors which assailed them, the verse implies that they needed to know, "not more *than* Christ, but more *of* Christ."—R.]

here of a previous presence at Colosse (WIGGERS, *Stud. und Krit.* 1838, p. 181). [Nor does ἐν πνεύματι refer to the Holy Spirit, even secondarily (DAVENANT).—R.] There is no proof here of the danger of enticement to which the Colossians were exposed, nor of the greatness of the Apostle's anxiety, though these are involved. This proof lies in what follows; a description of the possessions endangered through the dangerous false teachers: **joying and beholding your order and the steadfastness of your faith in Christ.**—"Joying and beholding" describe the mode of Paul's presence. The joy is emphasized by the position, in order to point to the noble possessions which it concerns: his joy on this account enchains him, so that he stands there as a spectator. The representations made by Epaphras were sufficient to bring him into this attitude, although he was then unknown and absent. The object of the "joying and beholding" is, *first*, "your order;" its opposite is ἀταξία. It is the external appearance of the Church in good order—fixed, orderly deportment (1 Cor. xiv. 40); ὑμῶν, placed first, indicates the contrast with the false teachers, who disturb such order. *Secondly*, "and the steadfastness of your faith in Christ," describes sharply and definitely the internal state of the Church. Στερέωμα, *firmamentum*, like τάξις, is a military word, a fortification into and upon which they could and should fall back; perhaps suggested by ἀγῶνα (ver. 1). 1 Pet. v. 9: στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει is similar. It is incorrect to regard the participles as a hendiadys: *cum gaudeo videns* (BENGEL), or *gaudeo videns* (GROTIUS), nor is καί causal: *quia video* (CALVIN), nor explicative: to wit (WINER's *Gram.* p. 438), nor can the order of words be called illogical. Neither should another object than that of βλέπων be given to χαίρων: his spiritual presence with the readers (MEYER, SCHENKEL), or about you (WINER), [apparently ELLICOTT, see ALFORD also —R.] Στερέωμα is not=στερεότης (HUTHER and others). [ALFORD: not any abstract quality, but as all nouns in -μα, the concrete product of the abstract quality.—R.] Finally we cannot limit this to a part of the Church (FLATT) which was unseduced, or apply it to the whole, hypothetically, were this the case (BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS). [ELLICOTT: "after these words we have no reason for doubting that the church at Colosse—was substantially sound in the faith."—R.]

Admonition to fidelity in walk, vers. 6, 7.

Ver. 6. **As then ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord.**—The emphasis rests upon ὡς: on which account καθὼς is repeated (ver. 7). "Ye have been taught" there corresponds to "ye have received" here. Comp. ver 8: κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν; Eph. iv. 20: ἐμάθετε; 1 Thess. ii. 13: παραλαβόντες—ἐδέξασθε. It is not then: have accepted [*angenommen habt*] (LUTHER and others); it refers to correct instruction. "Christ Jesus the Lord" [lit., the Christ, Jesus the Lord.—R.] sets forth the object, and "the summary of the whole confession" (MEYER), giving stronger prominence to the Person. "The Lord" marks, in apposition, what Jesus is for us, whom Paul had named "the Christ" over against God: τὸν κύριον is not to be interpreted, *ut dominum* (BENGEL and others). [ELLICOTT well remarks: "Though the reference seems mainly to reception by teaching, the object is so emphatically specified, as apparently to require a more inclusive meaning; they received not merely the *doctrinam Christi*, but Christ *Himself*, in Himself the sum and substance of all teaching"—R.] From the favorable state of the Christian cause, the Apostle deduces (οὖν), according to the received instruction, the obligation: **walk in him!**—Ἐν αὐτῷ standing first, is emphasized; He is the Life-element. "Walk" includes in agreement, external and internal mode and conduct of life. "In Him" is still further explained by

Ver. 7. **Rooted and built up**, ἐῤῥιζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι, [lit. "having been rooted and being built up."—R.]—The perfect denotes a concluded and still efficient fact,—the present, a continuing state, a process of becoming, a progressing development; hence it is not ἐποικοδομηθέντες (Eph. ii. 20) or τεθεμελιωμένοι (Eph. iii. 18). BENGEL: *præteritum pro initio, præsens etiam in progressu.* The figures are different, yet related. *Lucian de saltat.*, 34: ῥίζαι καὶ θεμέλιοι. Comp. Eph. iii. 18. Thus the readers are more closely characterized in their relation to Christ, and obligated to Christian walk. [The mixed figures mark "the stable growth and organic solidity of those who truly walk in Christ." "The accessory idea of the foundation is admirably conveyed by the ἐπί in the compound verb" (ELLICOTT).—R.] SCHENKEL is incorrect in beginning a new sentence here, because the participles do not correspond with "walk."—**In him,** is of course to be joined with both participles according to the figure. Christ is first regarded as the soil, and then as the corner stone, [foundation,—R.]; but not as the bond of the root-fibres and the parts of the building (SCHENKEL).

And stablished by faith—To the objective ground of life, the subjective element is thus added. Βεβαιούμενοι, also in the present, denotes a progressing development, the means of which is indicated by τῇ πίστει: the Christian is fortified by means of appropriating faith; it is almost=διὰ τῆς πίστεως (THEOPHYLACT), and not the dative of reference: "as to the faith" (DE WETTE). [The former view is that of MEYER, and EADIE, if ἐν be omitted. ALFORD and ELLICOTT, rejecting ἐν, adopt the latter view. If ἐν αὐτῇ, below, be retained, "faith" must be considered subjective, a view which is preferable on other grounds.—R.]—**As ye have been taught.**—Καθώς connects with τῇ πίστει, and ἐδιδάχθητε reminds of Epaphras (i. 7).—**Abounding therein with thanksgiving,** is subordinate to "stablished," in order to denote the tone in which the "becoming established" acts upon the extension and enlargement of the measure of faith. [ELLICOTT: "mainly reiterating with a quantitative, what had previously been expressed with a qualitative reference.—R.] Hence περισσεύοντες ἐν αὐτῇ is *abundantes ea, i. e., fide* (Phil. i. 9; Rom. xv. 13; 2 Cor. viii. 7), which is felt to be a privilege, a great gift; ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ=σὺν εὐχαριστίᾳ (ŒKUMEN). [ALFORD: "the field of operation in which that abundance is manifested." ELLICOTT more accurately distinguishes: "the *accompaniment* with which περισσ. ἐν πίστει was associated and as it were, environed."—R.] LUTHER in-

correctly joins (*reichlich dankbar*) "abundantly thankful:" the position of the words and the context, which treats of faith, are against this.

Warning against apostasy. Ver. 8.

Ver. 8. **Take heed lest there shall be any one that maketh you his booty.**—The future indicative (ἔσται) denotes an impending danger, whose entrance is feared as certain. (Heb. iii. 12; comp. Luke xi. 35; Gal. iv. 11. WINER's *Gram.* p. 469.) Ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν is not=συλαγωγῇ: it marks the continuance of this state; it is not simply that one or another one deceives them, but there is one or another there, who in character and action is a deceiver, ever misleads others. WINER's *Gram.* p. 326. Ὑμᾶς, emphatically placed, makes perceptible the advantages described in ver. 4, which they have above others [as well as indicating that they themselves were the booty to be carried away.—R.] The verb, occurring only here in New Testament, means *prædam abigere* (BENGEL: *qui non de vobis, sed vos ipsos spoliam faciat*): they themselves were made a spoil, lost to the Lord. LUTHER is incorrect; who may rob you; and the Vulgate (*decipiat*).

Through philosophy and vain deceit.—The means employed by the seducers. Since the preposition and article are not repeated, one means, a category is here presented. BENGEL: *quod adversarii jactabant esse philosophiam et sapientiam, id Paulus inanem fraudem esse dicit.* [Not "philosophy" in general, but what they called such, which was "vain deceit."—R.] In distinction from "enticing words," ver. 4, "philosophy" refers to the substance, the thought and doctrine (against THEODORET, CALVIN and others); in distinction from σύνεσις, ἐπίγνωσις, ἐπιστήμη (against TITTMANN), to a system; according to the state of the Church and the context, an Oriental, and according to vers. 11, 16, 18, somewhat Judaistic system, although the future (ἔσται) may point to one just arising. It is not to be regarded as Hellenic philosophy (TERTULLIAN), nor more particularly as Epicurean (CLEMENS ALEX.), or as Platonic and Stoic (HEUMANN), or Pythagorean (GROTIUS): nor yet as Gnosticism or Kabbalism (BRUCKER) whose germs were just discernible. Philo had already called the Jewish religion τὴν πάτριον φιλοσοφίαν, and Josephus speaks of the three doctrinal systems of the Essenes, Sadducees and Pharisees, as τρεῖς φιλοσοφίας; yet it is by no means equivalent on this account to *cultus divinus* (HEINRICH). Paul does not mean philosophy in itself (CALIXTUS: *si dicam, vide, ne decipiat vinum, nec vinum damno, nec usum ejus accuso, sed de vitando abusu moneo*), but a certain Judaistico-oriental one (MEYER)* which was in itself "vain deceit." Eph. v. 6. On this account the Apostle characterizes it more closely:

After the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world.—Emphatically asyndetic, with the preposition repeated; co-ordinate clauses, which are to be joined, not with the verb, but with what immediately precedes. The first: κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων marks the origin as purely human in contrast with the revelation from God (BENGEL: *antitheton, deitatis*). The other: κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου marks the substance (BENGEL: *antitheton, corporaliter*, ver. 9). Τὰ στοιχεῖα, used in a physical sense 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12, is here, as in ver. 20; Gal. iv. 3, 9; Heb. v. 12, used in a spiritual, didactic sense; beginnings in education, the A B C of knowledge, upon which childish thoughts the Christian as a man looks down (1 Cor. xiii. 11). It is incorrect to interpret: principles of the moral life in the world (HUTHER); precepts of the world (LUTHER); *rudimenta legis ritualia* is too limited (SCHAUBACH: *Commentatio, qua exponitur quid στ. τ. κοσ. in N. T. sibi veluit*). Comp. on ver. 20. [WORDSWORTH's interpretation, following that of the Fathers, is curious: "The physical elements, such as the Sun and Moon, regulating times and seasons; and according to superstitious observances of times, *Fasts, New Moons*, and *Seventh* Day Sabbaths ordered thereby, as if they were of the same importance as articles of faith, and equally necessary to salvation." ELLICOTT's view is to be preferred: "all rudimental religious teaching of *non-Christian* character, whether heathen or Jewish or a commixture of both,—the first element *possibly* slightly predominating in thought here, the second in ver. 20." Whether the immediate reference be to Judaistic errors or not, the phrase must not be limited to Jewish worship (EADIE) or ritualistic observances (ALFORD), for the Apostle is not describing the things themselves, but giving the category (κατά) to which they belong. A careful investigation of his use of the phrase will not justify any such limitation. Comp. *Galatians*, pp. 96, 105.—R.]—**And not after Christ.**—Sharply conclusive, comprehensive negative. Comp. Eph. i. 21; 2 Cor. v. 17. Incorrect: after the doctrine of Christ (ERASMUS and others). [MEYER: "The activity of this συλαγωγεῖν does not have Christ as its objective norm." EADIE: "True Christian science has Him for its centre and Him for its object." On the whole verse the notes of WORDSWORTH are very full and interesting as grouping the patristic authorities respecting the angel-worship of the early heretics.—R.]

Praise of the glory of Christ and His work. Vers. 9–15.

Ver. 9. **Because in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.**—Ὅτι confirms the warning against a doctrine which does not have its norm in Christ, supposing it can transcend Him and yet not attaining to Him. By "in Him dwelleth" (κατοικεῖ not κατῴκησε) Jesus, whose importance is to be portrayed, is described as a habitation, whose value rests upon what is at home there. ["In him" is emphatic, *in him* and in none other than him (ELLICOTT).—R.] This is then "all the fulness of the Godhead" (i. 19; comp. Rom. xv. 29; xi. 25). Θεότης

* [MEYER remarks: "This φιλοσοφία is not *philosophy in itself and in general*, however much it had, in its decay and according to its manifestation in that age, proven itself to the Apostle as folly in comparison with the wisdom of the gospel, but the *definite* speculation, *known* to his readers, which obtained in Colosse and that region, and which consisted of gnostic theosophy blended with Judaism (Essenism), designated by the name philosophy, on account of its ontological character, and in general, irrespective of its relation to the truth rightly so called; but perhaps put forward also by the false teachers themselves under this designation, which is the more probable, since Paul uses the word only in this passage." So EADIE, ALFORD and ELLICOTT substantially.—R.]

must be distinguished from θειότης (Rom. i. 20); the former, *vocabulum abstractum significantissimum* (BENGEL), means *Deitas*, Godhead [*das Gottsein*], the Divine Essence; the latter, *Divinitas*, Divinity [*Göttlichkeit*], the Divine Quality; what is here viewed metaphysically is regarded in i. 19, charismatically (MEYER). Θεότης is not to be understood as meaning God's will (the SOCINIANS), Divine grace and gift (SCHLEIERMACHER), nor does "all the fulness of the Godhead" refer to the Christian Church (HEINRICH, SCHENKEL and others). Σωματικῶς, placed last for emphasis, limits "dwelleth," which refers, in the present, to the permanent state of the present and exalted Christ, founded (i. 15) upon His nature, and is to be regarded, in contrast with "rudiments of the world" (ver. 8), and "shadows" (ver. 17), as indicating the full nature of the matter, and from the relation of οἶκος and σῶμα (2 Cor. v. 1 sq.) with a reference to the Incarnation (HOFFMANN, *Schriftbew.* II. pp. 27 sq, 533; SCHMID, *Bibl. Theologie*, 2, p. 301). Hence it is neither = οὐσιωδῶς (CYRIL, STEIGER, HUTHER), since there is no contrast between οὐσία in Christ and ἐνέργεια in the prophets, nor = ἐν τῷ σώματι, whether this be referred to the Church (SCHENKEL) or to the body, which He assumed of the Virgin, that is now glorified (MEYER): before the Incarnation He was ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ (Phil. ii. 6). Beyond Christ there is no eternal truth; beyond Him is away from Him. [WORDSWORTH interprets: 1, *substantially and truly* (Hilary); 2, *bodily*, in distinction from "soul" (Council of Antioch),—quoting Augustine, who combines both views. But the literal interpretation is far preferable: "in bodily fashion" (ELLICOTT). "Before His Incarnation the fulness dwelt in Him, as the λόγος ἄσαρκος, but not σωματικῶς, as now that He is the λόγος ἔνσαρκος" (ALFORD). If this be the correct view, then with MEYER we must regard the present, κατοικεῖ, as referring the whole expression to the glorified Christ. He also finds an apologetic design in the emphasis given to the adverb, "bodily," since the false teachers, "by their doctrine of angels (comp. ver. 10), appear to have spiritualistically split up the πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος."—R.]

Ver. 10. **And ye are made full in him.**—[Perhaps to bring out the double predication involved in the position of the words, it were better to render: "And ye (*being*) in Him are made full."—R.] Καί is a simple copulative, making the clause depend upon ὅτι. Ἐστέ (not γίνεσθε) standing first is pregnant: "ye are," need not first become so; the "being" is more strongly marked than the subject, in contrast to Christ; hence ὑμεῖς is not expressed. It is not the imperative (GROTIUS and others): *Beneficium Christi, non nostrum officium* (CALOV.). But only in Him are they πεπληρωμένοι. ERASMUS: *Christo cum sitis semel insiti;* BENGEL: *ipse plenus, nos replete.* LUTHER is incorrect: *vollkommen.* [E. V. also—"complete." EADIE's translation is given above; ALFORD: "filled up;" ELLICOTT, as above, also "filled full,"—Rhemish, "in Him replenished."—R.] The perfect excludes the further effect of the fact. Neither τῆς θεότητος (THEOPHYLACT and others) nor *sapientia et virtute* (BENGEL) is to be supplied; the first is not indicated by the text, which does not read καὶ ὑμεῖς, nor the second by the context. Divine Truth, Power, Life are treated of. Comp. Eph. iii. 19; Jno. i. 16.—[MEYER: "Out of the 'fulness of the Godhead' which dwells in Christ, flows the being made full of the Christian, which therefore has its ground in none other than Christ and in nothing else than fellowship with Him. Filled *with what?* The answer is self-evident to the consciousness of the reader. It is the *charismatic* πλήρωσις, which Christians in virtue of their vital union with the Lord have received and continually possess, out of the *metaphysical* πλήρωμα dwelling in Christ, out of the 'fulness of the Godhead.'"—R.]

Who is the head of all principality and power.—This affirms the absolute dignity of Christ over against the angelic world (ver. 18). Comp. i. 18. In Him they may, must have enough.

Ver. 11. **In whom ye also were circumcised.**—[Καί, "also," emphasizes the fact stated by the verb, which is a historical aorist: hence "were" not "are" (E. V.).—R.] The reference is to their entrance into Christianity, to conversion, regeneration in Christ. The Christian is circumcised, not indeed as the Judaistic teachers required, with the Jewish circumcision, but: **with a circumcision made without hands**, περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ ["not hand-wrought." ELLICOTT.—R.]—The Jewish external rite was χειροποίητος (Eph. ii. 11). Comp. Rom. ii. 28, 29; Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6; Jer. ix. 26; Ezek. xliv. 7; Acts vii. 51. He then sets forth, wherein this spiritual circumcision of the heart, which is better than the Jewish, consists: **in the putting off the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ.**—[The E. V. not only retains "of the sins," but is faulty in punctuation; the second ἐν also it renders "by," when it is parallel to the first.—R.] The first clause is in contrast with the externality, the second with the "hand" that performs it: according to the former this circumcision is a moral advance, according to the latter an act of Christ. "In the putting off the body of the flesh" describes the body on which it takes place, as belonging to the flesh (σάρξ), entirely corresponding with the context, and parallel to "the body of sin" (Rom. vi. 6), which lives in the flesh, so that it is not indifferent (see Eph. ii. 3). The material, earthly body is not spoken of here, as in i. 22, but the sinfully sensuous organism, "the old man" (Rom. vii. 14). The substantive ἀπέκδυσις (only here) is emphatic and in contrast with the circumcision, which severs only a small part. It is joined with τοῦ σώματος, which naturally neither means, *massa*, totality (CALVIN and others), nor refers to Christ's body and His death (SCHNECKENBURGER), since αὐτοῦ is wanting. LUTHER, retaining τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, renders incorrectly: "the sinful body in the flesh."—"In the circumcision of Christ" presents nothing new or important, except in the genitive, which denotes the author (THEODORET: αἴτιος) of the circumcision. [ELLICOTT: "*the originating cause;* Christ by union with Himself brings about the circumcision and imparts it to believers."—R.] It is incorrect to apply it to the circumcision to which Christ was subjected (SCHÖTTGEN), or to view Christ only as the Me-

diator of it (MEYER). Nor should we on account of *ἀχειροποιήτου* apply it to baptism (STORR [ALFORD apparently], and others).

Ver. 12. **Buried with him in baptism.**—The participle *συνταφέντες*, following *περιετμήθητε* (ver. 11), denotes the progress of the entrance of conversion. "Putting off the body" reminded of death; "being buried" was readily suggested. *Αὐτῷ*, governed by *σύν* in composition, denotes the fellowship with Christ, which is consummated "in baptism," that is a water bath and a water grave for the "old man." Comp. Rom. vi. 3, 4. We live Christ's life, with and through Him, symbolically, ethically, spiritually, but actually and really. ["Burial implies a previous death." "The reality of death is evinced by burial." "This point of burial they had reached—when they were baptized—for then they personally professed a faith which implied the death of sin within them" (EADIE). The reference to burial in connexion with baptism, suggests, that death to sin had already taken place, hence this ordinance has not in itself any efficacy "in the putting off the body of the flesh." There is no doubt that the participle describes an action nearly contemporaneous with that of the preceding verb. This rite would speedily follow the "putting off;" though ALFORD is scarcely correct: "the new life being begun at baptism."—Braune admits, as must be done, an allusion to *immersion* in baptism, but enters into no discussion as to the *mode;* the question is not deemed so important in Germany as it has been made here. EADIE says: "Whatever may be otherwise said in favor of immersion, it is plain that here the burial is wholly ideal.—Believers are buried in baptism, but even in immersion they do not go through a process having any resemblance to the burial and resurrection of Christ." ALFORD correctly admits an allusion to the *κατάδυσις* and *ἀνάδυσις* in baptism, but adds, "To maintain from such a circumstance that *immersion* is *necessary* in baptism, is surely the merest trifling, and a resuscitation of the very ceremonial spirit which the Apostle here is arguing against." A fair exegesis must allow that the passage proves immersion to be baptism; whether baptism is immersion turns on something else than exegesis; see controversial works on both sides of the question. A list will be found, LANGE's *Com.* Matthew, p. 560.—R.]

In whom ye were also raised together through the faith.—[So Braune renders. The aorist *συνηγέρθητε*, must be rendered "were raised." Whether raised "together" or "with Him," depends upon the reference in *ἐν ᾧ*: in baptism or in Christ.—R.] *Ἐν ᾧ* is parallel to *ἐν ᾧ* (ver. 11), and refers like *ὅς* (ver. 10) to Christ and not to baptism; *καὶ συνηγέρθητε* does not confirm the latter reference, but requires the former, since *καί* renders prominent an advance from the "burial" in immersion at baptism—the new life would not enter with the immersion but with the emersion, and we should find *ἐξ οὗ* or *δι' οὗ* [*i. e.*, were the reference to baptism.—R.]. The fellowship with the life of Christ ("raised together") rests upon union with His Person (*ἐν ᾧ*). [So DAVENANT, MEYER, EADIE. For the other view, see ALFORD and ELLICOTT *in loco.*—R.] Hence there is no pleonasm here (DE WETTE), nor any reference to the resurrection of the body, which is an ideal possession before the *parousia*, but becomes a reality with it (MEYER, the Greek Fathers: *καὶ γὰρ ἐγηγέρμεθα τῇ δυνάμει, εἰ καὶ μὴ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ*). *Συνηγέρθητε* denotes an accomplished fact, corresponding with that accomplished in baptism, and like this, actual, but according to the context, spiritual, ethical. After the negative side of dying to sin, the positive side of a new life is set forth, prominence being given to the subjective appropriation, *διὰ τῆς πίστεως*, hinted at already in *ἐν ᾧ*. BENGEL is excellent: *ut mors est ante resurrectionem, sic baptismus natura præcedit fidem adultam.* The genitive depending on *πίστεως*: **of the operation of God**, can only set forth the object, since only this (Eph. iii. 12; Phil. i. 27; iii. 9; Rom. iii. 22; Gal. ii. 16, 20; iii. 22), or the believing subject (ver. 5; i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 3, iii. 2) is denoted by the genitive. [ELLICOTT, while taking this as the genitive *objecti*, considers the statement of MEYER, referred to above, and endorsed by EADIE and ALFORD, as not *perfectly* certain.—R.] LUTHER is incorrect: "which God works."

God is then characterized: **who hath raised him from the dead**, because the syllogism runs: Has God raised Christ, then can He also bring me to new life (comp. Eph. i. 19, 20). It is precisely through faith in such an "operation of God," that this is experienced.

Ver. 13. **And you being dead in your sins.**—["When you were dead," ELLICOTT.—R.] See on Eph. ii. 1-5. Here the "being *dead*" is more strongly marked, than the "*being;*" there the simple dative marks the cause of this condition, here the results manifesting the condition are added; there inward motions (*ἁμαρτία*) are added to outward transgressions (*παραπτώματα*), here is added: **and the uncircumcision of your flesh** (the preposition "in" is supplied in thought).—This means the uneradicated, sensuous, sinful nature which marked the heathen. "Uncircumcision" according to the context is ethical, spiritual (Deut. x. 16; Jere. iv. 4), and is more closely characterized by the genitive. This is epexegetical, *σάρξ* being used, as in ver. 11, in the ethical sense, so that the carnal nature is regarded as their uncircumcision (BLEEK). BENGEL: *exquisita appellatio peccati originalis.* MEYER is incorrect in taking *νέκρους* and *ἀκροβυστία* literally, and *σάρξ* as indifferent. [MEYER seems to place the moral significance in *τῆς σαρκός*, hence *ἀκροβυστία*, which is their state still, is now indifferent (ALFORD). This gives to *ἀκροβ.* its literal meaning. EADIE takes the whole phrase literally: "Uncircumcision of the flesh was the physical mark of a heathen state." ELLICOTT gives a slight ethical force to *σαρκός*, which he considers a possessive genitive—they were heathens, unconverted heathens as their very bodies could attest. Braune's view seems more in accordance with the context.—R.]

You hath he quickened together with him, *συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ.* See on Eph. iii. 5. *Ὑμᾶς* [omitted in Rec.; "you" to be inserted in E. V.—R.] and *σύν* ["together with"—R.] are repeated as an emphatic reminder to the readers. MEYER incorrectly takes the verb in its literal sense [doubtless to correspond with his interpretation of the preceding context—R.], and HEINRICH

makes Christ the subject, when the context requires "God," quite as much as it refers to the new spiritual life beginning with regeneration, which is eternal life to be perfected at the resurrection. [ELLICOTT also makes "Christ" the subject, rendering "with Himself." His interpretation of the whole passage is modified by this view, which he ably defends; see his notes *in loco*, which are highly suggestive. Still the predicates throughout are better applied to God; those in this verse, "quickened" and "forgiven," being so generally ascribed to God, that the burden of proof rests with those who take the other view. As they have not succeeded in showing a preponderance of reasons in its favor, it is safer to consider "God" the subject (comp. MEYER).—R.]

The mode of the life is described; **having forgiven us all trespasses**, *χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα* (CHRYSOSTOM: *ἃ τὴν νεκρότητα ἐποίει*).—The objective act of reconciliation and justification is referred to, and its universal efficacy denoted by "us" [not "you," the Colossians merely, but all believers. —R.] At the same time the connection between the new life beginning with pardon and justification, and the propitiation of the wrath of God and reconciliation of man with Him is hinted at. BENGEL: *cum hac liberatione a peccato conjuncta est liberatio ab opprobrio peccati* (ver. 14) *et liberatio a potestate tenebrarum* (ver. 15).

Ver. 14. **Having blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us.**—"Having blotted out" (*ἐξαλείψας*), joined like the preceding participle to "quickened together," is contemporaneous,* and describes significantly the act of Divine grace. The verb (here and Acts iii. 19; Rev. iii. 5; vii. 17; xxi. 4) means to wash out, then to obliterate. "The handwriting against us" is the law obligating us and proving our debt, witnessing against us, a bond [*Schulddokument*], (Job v. 3; ix. 5). It means God's law among Gentiles and Jews (Rom. ii. 14, 15), not the Mosaic law merely (MEYER); hence we cannot here distinguish between the moral and ceremonial law, and refer this exclusively to the former (LUTHER), or to the latter only (CALVIN), which is also a moral affair, and affects the conscience. "All trespasses" are here treated of [hence "the whole law" DAVENANT, ELLICOTT — R.], and Christ's death for the Gentiles also, indeed here with special reference to them. The dative *τοῖς δόγμασιν* (see Eph. ii. 15; *ἐν δόγμασιν*) denotes the contents of the handwriting, written with well-known commandments (MEYER), as Gal. vi. 11. This is explained by the adjectival and verbal character of the word *χειρόγραφον*. [The verbal element governing the dative. MEYER would make the dative instrumental; ELLICOTT makes it the dative with reference to, that in which the hostile aspect was specially evinced," objecting decidedly to the government by the verbal element. EADIE and ALFORD agree with Braune: "The simple dative of form, that distinctive and well known form which the handwriting assumed.—R.] The dative is not=consisting in commandments, (CALVIN), nor instead of the genitive (CASTELLIO), nor to be joined to *καθ' ἡμῶν* (CALOV.), nor connected with both the preceding expressions (WINER'S *Gram.*, p. 206); as little does it belong to "having blotted out" in the sense: with reference to ordinances (STEIGER, HARLESS on Eph. i. 1), or through the gospel doctrine of faith (the Greek fathers). SCHENKEL joins it with what follows appealing to Acts i. 22: *διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου οὓς ἐξελέξατο*, and BLEEK also without sufficient grounds.

Which was contrary to us.—This relative clause is only an emphatic repetition of *καθ' ἡμῶν* (MEYER), and not to be distinguished from it as is done by BENGEL: *contra esse et inimicum esse differunt, sicut status belli et ipsa pugna.* [ELLICOTT: "an expansion of the preceding: it was hostile not merely in its direction and aspects, but practically and definitely." There is no idea of secret hostility, *sub contrarius.*—R.]

And he has taken it out of the way.—The perfect denotes the completed, still efficient fact; the handwriting is not only blotted out, it is removed entirely, and this continues to be so. Thus the transition from the participial to the finite construction is explained (as i. 26; WINER'S *Gram.* p. 533). The mode of taking it away is described: **By nailing it to his cross** ["to the cross."—R.] It was the law rather than Christ, which was slain and done away with on the cross, because He bore the curse of the law, took away its condemnation. Men slew Christ, but the Lord slew the law on the cross. Gal. ii. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 24. [There seems to be no ground for the opinion, that there is here an allusion to the cancelling of a bond, by driving a nail through it, although WORDSWORTH expresses the thought thus strikingly: "He nailed the bond of our debt to the Tree, and as by the Tree in Paradise we became debtors to God in the first Adam, so by the Tree in Calvary we received remission of our debt in the Second Adam."—R.]

Ver. 15. **And having spoiled principalities and powers.**—*Ἀπεκδυσάμενος*, found only here and iii. 9. It denotes the result of the contest against the wicked angels (comp. i. 16; ii. 10; Eph. ii. 2; vi. 11, 12), and has an emphatic position at the beginning of the sentence before the finite verb. BENGEL: *qui angelos bonas colebant, malos timebant; neutrum jure.* The verb is well rendered by the Vulgate: *exspolians.* The middle signification, which is unmistakable in iii. 9, falls into the back ground here. [Two points are open to discussion here: 1. What is the meaning of *ἀπεκδυσάμενος*? 2. What is the reference in *τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας*? 1. The more common interpretation is as above, "having spoiled," but WORDSWORTH, ELLICOTT, ALFORD, render "having divested himself of," "putting off," giving the middle sense. 2. Of what did He divest Himself? Here the commentators above mentioned differ. WORDSWORTH and ELLICOTT, taking Christ as the subject, refer "principalities and powers" to opposing hostile powers of evil, and follow Hilary, Augustine, in explaining thus: the powers of evil had power against Christ, as mortal in His flesh: He divested Himself of His flesh, by thus doing He di-

[* MEYER with reason insists that it is not contemporaneous, but means: "after he had blotted out," etc. "The divine work of redemption in Christ must occur before the forgiveness, through appropriation of it by the believers, could take place."—R.]

vested Himself of them. See WORDSWORTH's full notes upholding this view. Still it seems to be a forced interpretation. ALFORD does not admit that these principalities and powers are infernal potentates. He considers that the angelic agency (Gal. iii. 19) in the giving of the law is referred to, and these "put off" by the abrogation and taking away of the law, God manifesting Himself henceforward without a vail in the exalted Person of Jesus. This too seems forced. The view so strongly supported by MEYER, which takes God as the subject, "spoiling" as the meaning of the participle, and the infernal powers as referred to in "principalities and powers," is preferable to either of the others, on the ground of simplicity and accordance with the subsequent context.—R.] Thus deprived of their power, stripped of their armor as it were, in their helplessness: **He made a shew of them with boldness.**—Ἐδειγμάτισεν (only here and Matt. i. 19) has God as its subject, who now as in a triumph makes a show to their shame and His honor: the subject being the same as that of ἀπεκδυσάμενος, it is not repeated. Ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ is "frankly and freely" (*frank und frei*), and denotes the confidence and certainty of the complete, permanent victory (comp. 1 Jno. ii. 28) [LANGE's *Commentary*, p. 82.—R.] "Openly" (LUTHER) [and E. V.] is already found in the verb. [The idea of putting to shame (παραδειγματίσαι) does not necessarily belong to the simple verb. ALFORD, to carry out his view of the object of the verb, renders ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ "in openness" of speech, declaring and revealing by the cross, that there is none but Christ the Head of all principalities and powers. For this there seems to be no good support.—R.]

Triumphing over them in it. — Here θριαμβεύσας αὐτούς means "triumphing over them," while 2 Cor. ii. 14: θριαμβεύσας ἡμᾶς has the force of the Hiphil: "making us to triumph." "Them" means the persons conceived of as "principalities and powers." Ἐν αὐτῷ denotes the place of contest, the cross (ver. 14). It is not*=*in Christo* (BENGEL), [ALFORD, margin of English Bible—R.]. It was precisely "the cross, this symbol of shame and sorrow, which was the place of victory over the enemies of God" (SCHENKEL).

[On the whole verse, see EADIE. Both he and Braune agree entirely with MEYER, whose exegesis of this passage is highly satisfactory. WORDSWORTH is unusually full and valuable on this section, though his comments belong more properly to the homiletical department. ELLICOTT's exegesis is modified by his taking Christ as the subject throughout.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Paul's care of the Churches.* Great is the sympathy of Paul, who not only has in eye and mind, as the Epistles to the Corinthians show, all the members of a Christian congregation, but fraternally remembers in prayer and paternally cares for with his counsel, all congregations of the Church of his Lord, even those personally unknown to him, whenever, as in this case, through the coming of Epaphras to him, a way of God's pointing out is opened to him. He does not step aside from his calling, from his immediate sphere of duty, but takes root in the soil appointed to him and bears fruit, but fruit for many without, as far as in him lies, for all. No one can appeal to the Apostle and his part in the great work, who does not take root and bear fruit in his own immediate calling, as though it were too narrow for him.

2. *Error a calamity.* The Apostle regards error and entanglement therein as calamity and sorrow, which begins with wavering and uncertainty, and has its root in moral deficiency. Hence his sympathizing solicitude, hence his παρακαλεῖν directed to their καρδίας (ver. 2). [EADIE: "The conflict of error with truth could not but lead to distraction and mental turmoil; and in proportion to their misconception of the gospel, or their confusion of idea with regard to its spirit, contents and aim, would be their loss of that peace and solace, which the new religion had imparted to them."—R.]

3. *Christian unity.* That saying of RUPERTUS MELDENIUS in the seventeenth century: *in necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in utrisque caritas*, could have been taken from ver. 2, where "in love" sets forth the subjective, and "unto full knowledge of the mystery of God" the objective *moment* of true unity. The "mystery" is the "necessary" matter, in which there must be unity; for *a*) as to its *nature* it is entirely *God's affair*; *b*) as to its *purport* it is the fulness of *all wisdom and knowledge*, the treasury of all truth in the world and the plan of salvation in the kingdom of God; *c*) as to its *position* it is a *fact revealed and revealing in Christ*; *d*) as to its *end*, it *reaches* into *eternity*; *e*) as to its *mission*, it *guides* protectingly through *time* with its errors and dangers; *f*) as to its *requirements*, it concerns *believing acceptance* and *living* therein. [Be-living, which is implied etymologically and practically in believing.—R.] Accordingly the one *centre* of both the mystery and the unity is Christ in His Being and work. [Still more if we adopt the reading which makes Christ Himself the mystery. The one "necessary" matter, about which there must be unity, is the answer to the question, "what think ye of Christ?"—R.]

4. *The Being of Christ* is all the fulness of the Godhead in bodily reality (ver. 9). This Pauline statement is related to the Johannine; "the Word became flesh;" the latter gives prominence to the historical incarnation, the former to the permanent state of the Exalted One.

5. *The Work of Christ* is pre-supposed as that of a mediator, who suffered death upon the Cross as an atonement for us, whom God the Father has raised again, in order that this fact of salvation should be made of benefit to us; it is essentially of an ethical nature.

6. *Salvation* is essentially *a new life*, the cause of which is God (the subject in vers. 13–15), the mediation of which is in Christ, resting *objectively* upon *Christ's death on the Cross*, whereby forgiveness of sin has been provided, the accusations and curse of the law done away, the power of the kingdom of darkness broken, and beginning *subjectively* with faith, the principle of the new life,

* [The original omits "not," but it is an obvious typographical error, which I have corrected without hesitation.—R.]

types of which are found both in the Old Testament and the life of Christ. The circumcision of the Old Testament corresponds with baptism in the New; both point, *formally*, to a putting away, the former partially, to a separation, the latter *totally*, to a dying, since the immersion points to the burial of Christ (vers. 11, 12; Rom. vi. 34); *materially*, both apply to the flesh, on which the sinful nature depends; the dying, being buried and rising again of Christ are events in His life which the believer, in contrast with the world, in and about him, must experience in his inner, moral life. In Christ, therefore, that is fulfilled, which before Him was only hinted at, prefigured; and only from Him and in Him, by means of faith, can the participation in this fulfilment be gained. [EADIE: "The Apostle looks on circumcision and baptism as being closely connected—the spiritual blessing symbolized by both being of a similar nature; though, probably, it would be straining this connection to allege it as a proof that baptism has been in all points ordained for the Church in room of circumcision."—To this may be added that just so far as we can refer to this passage in support of any mode of baptism, to the same extent we can find in it a proof of the connexion between baptism and circumcision. If we press it in the first direction, we must also in the second, as Braune does. Whatever may be gained from it in support of immersion, is equally gained for pædo-baptism.—R.]

7. *Sin* has so widely developed its power, that not only does every man stand under that power, but each man entirely: he is dead in his sinful doing and sinful being (ver. 13), so that he must be born again. It is the first power, which Christ endured to the uttermost and, sinlessly, victoriously, overcame on the cross in His propitiatory death. With the pardon of sin the new life begins.

8. *The law*, given on account of sin and against it as an external one, is contrary to man in his sin as his accuser. In Christ it is fulfilled, in Him it is satisfied. Against Him it can present no accusation and no guilt: He is the Fulfilled. Bodily law, which He has at once upheld and torn; upheld on the side of righteousness, torn and done away with on the side of the accuser and the curse. Only when the law is satisfied, is it done and done away; this has taken place in Christ and takes place only in Him.

9. *The kingdom of darkness*, the spiritual powers of evil have in sin their power over man, but lost it on the sinless Redeemer; in the atoning death of Christ, they gained a victory which was their defeat. Only he who lives to the flesh, remains under the dominion of the Evil one: whoever dies to sin and the flesh with Christ is snatched from this and has a share in the victory of Christ.

10. *All mental culture*, even the bloom of an organic science, of a *philosophy*, a love of wisdom, which is merely the intellectual product of the human mind, which does not proceed out of a moral life founded on Christ's life and rooted in Him, is idle, empty deceit and illusion. That which is most elegant, most noble and great without Christ is only elementary, imperfect in comparison with what He offers: the simplest, plainest of what is offered in Him, exceeds that in value. An humble Christian has and can do and knows, more and better than an unchristian philosopher. What is Christian alone is worthy of humanity, humane. As truly Christian life surpasses any other nobly moral life, so truly Christian opinion is more important and more truthful than any otherwise important speculative knowledge.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Do not meddle in spheres and activities, which do not concern you, but, with the gifts entrusted to you, labor in the calling to which you are appointed; do not seek only for intimate friends of the same mind and station as yourself, perhaps in wider circles, to make amends for those indolent or opposed about you.—Take no offence at the ocean depth of the mystery of Redemption in Christ; the pearls of truth and wisdom, thou canst only find there. Before the truths become a harvest which we gather in, they are dull clouds in the distance, or ore in the depths.—What thou receivest as seed, return as blossom, what thou receivest as blossom, return as fruit.—Only the fellowship which has its cement in love, has its eternal end in true knowledge.—Entering into worldly mental culture without, thou not only losest something, but art thyself lost; lost to God and bound to human principles; you forego a blessed eternity, as you gaily go down the stream of time. No stand-points are more inferior than those without Christ, however well esteemed they may be of men.—Three powers are to be feared: 1) the power of Satan who stands behind the flesh and its motions; 2) the power of the flesh, that breaks out in sin; 3) the power of the law, that appears against our sin as accuser.

CALVIN:—Ver. 15. No tribunal so magnificent, no regal throne so glorious, no triumphal pomp so splendid, no chariot so sublime, as was that gibbet upon which Christ overcame death and the devil, the prince of death, whom He utterly bruised under His feet.

STARKE:—There are three excellent peculiarities, which must be found in a preacher, and also in *any* Christian, if he would make others know a matter; 1) that he himself be certain of its truth; 2) that he be able rightly to convince others of the same; 3) that he have a good end in view.—As a mother, who has children suffering in various degrees of sickness, attends most to the one who lies lowest, but never on that account permits herself to neglect or slight the others, so an instructor cares most for those hearers, who are in the most dangerous circumstances; yet not so as to forget or neglect the others.—See what belongs to genuine Christianity; a wealth and certainty of faith, a knitting together of hearts in love, a walk in Christ.—When we rightly know and have Christ, we know and have enough, though we know and have nothing else.—God's word is an inexhaustible mine full of treasures and riches; seek! dig! test! you will find one after another unto your spiritual and eternal delight.—Rational speeches are not always the truth, nor are learning and skill always a certain evidence of truth.—If we are rooted

in Christ, we must prove by bearing fruit as trees of righteousness. Are we built on Christ, we must stand steadfast and unmovable, so that no winds and rains of affliction can overthrow us. A good inflow makes a good outflow; he who takes in much, can and must also give out much. Since then believers receive so much from and in Christ, so their active gratitude must flow copiously forth in unremitting obedience. — The Church is not a school of sages, where each can display the fanciful dreams of his reason.—In matters of faith the reason is an unfaithful and deceitful guide, that delivers us to error and delusion. The gospel is the true Christian philosophy, transcending all science, all human institutions, from which it can accept no law.—God is the creditor, we His debtors. 1) He is Omniscient, we cannot conceal a debt from Him; 2) He is almighty, He can exact the debt by force; 3) He is just, He will and must be paid; 4) He is omnipresent, none can escape Him. Who must not fear on this account?

GERLACH:—To every man, unenlightened, following his own wisdom, the mystery, plainly as it is revealed in the gospel, is closed, as to the blind eye the sun at mid day does not shine. But whoever knows how to study this great book, Jesus Christ, God manifest in the flesh, finds all knowledge therein. Humility opens the book, faith reads it, and love understands it.—[Jesus Christ; 1) The *way* on which the Christians walk; 2) the *root* from which they draw all their life-sap, 3) the *foundation* on which their whole inner life should rest.—R.]

RIEGER:—In natural things man prefers seeing all with his own eyes, and resting on his own observation rather than on what others can tell him. In the kingdom of grace however, one must be of such a tender heart, that he from the "being knit together in love," accepts much that others have experienced.—Among the Corinthians there was more of intelligence and knowledge, but less of submissive love reaching to others. On this account he pruned their knowledge and guided them to growing strength in love. Among the Colossians there was more of tractable love, but without sufficient light. Hence he had a conflict, that their obedient love should not be abused, but that they might acquire minds expert in examination.—The Apostle's word of incitement: walk in Him, means more than following in His footsteps, it signifies, that for such a walk as He walked, all strength is derived from Christ, that the walk is a fruit borne from Christ the vine.—In the time when God permitted the heathen to walk their own ways, He yet granted some footprints, from which something of Him and His truth could be made an object of search. On the part of God these were given as serviceable rudiments, but on the part of men they did not remain purely so. And if now-a-days any one will extol these as the choice relics of antiquity, it is as though some one should devote himself to a heap of sweepings, to find there a lost pearl.

SCHLEIERMACHER.—Ripeness of understanding in regard to the kingdom of God and intelligence respecting the things of this world are not together (Matt. xi. 25; Luke xvi. 8).—Love furthers the growth and maturity of the understanding.—[Why we continue in Christ? He has 1) not only the words of eternal life, but 2) the power of eternal life.—R.]

HEUBNER:—Unity, firm knitting together, incorporation in love, increases the "*plerophy*" [πληροφίας fulness, made an adjective in E. V. ver. 2.—R.]: the correct, firm conviction, the confidence in our insight, when we are certain of the matter.—External discipline and order must ever accompany faith in the life of the Church. Paul mentions their "order" first, because it first meets the eye.—In Christian faith there must be constancy. Growth therein is necessary, but change is destructive.—Man may learn to know himself from the wisdom of the world, but it cannot help him.—He who has the fulness, can give abundantly. In Christ we have abundance, all others let us hunger. Christ's word satisfies, contents the soul.—All, whom Christ has not awakened, are to be regarded as still dead.—[He who remains under Christ's standard, conquers.—R.]

PASSAVANT:—What now-a-days is so gladly shunned by many pious people, sometimes as dangerous, again as unprofitable, the Apostle here holds to be necessary, aye, he labors and struggles to bring souls thither. He would know of no poverty of spirit, which, made up of sheer laziness and cowardice, is willingly satisfied with superficial knowledge of saving truth: he insisted rather upon that riches of knowledge and of spirit, which contributes to the genuine poverty of an humble spirit. He would know of no blind or dim faith, but of open seeing eyes. He sought to produce in the Colossians a clear understanding, a plenitude of knowledge,—that their knowledge might suffer from no defects, be diseased from no obscurations or fluctuations, that might profoundly penetrate and gaze into the mystery of God and the Father.—Gratitude then helps us to stand, and joyously stand fast before every foreign spirit, before every foreign power, in every temptation and conflict; it is a rock, from which the darts of unbelief rebound. When the Roman proconsul on the judgment-seat urged that holy man Polycarp to curse Jesus Christ to save his life, the martyr answered, "For eighty-six years I have served Him: He has never yet done me harm. How can I blaspheme my King, who has saved me?"—"Vain deceit," Paul calls all human worldly wisdom and doctrine, which knows nothing of one true God; "tradition of men, rudiments of the world," all that oriental philosophy, which with its old and new twilight, its destructive atmosphere, marred the divine doctrine, it would enlarge and complete,—"vain deceit," that Jewish leaven, which through its ancient consequence, through use and abuse of the Mosaic ordinances and principles, threatened to rob the disciples of their new freedom, or stint them therein, to put again upon them "a yoke which neither their fathers nor they themselves were able to bear."—

For the Reformation festival [October 31st, anniversary of the nailing of Luther's theses on the church-door at Wittenberg, 1517.—R.] (ver. 6–9). How do we prove ourselves abundantly grateful for the regeneration of our Church? If we 1) hold fast to the ground of salvation, which it proclaims to us; 2) use the means of salvation,

which it offers to us; 3) walk in the way of salvation, which it prescribes to us.

[BISPING:—Ver. 6. Notice that Paul here says, "ye have received *Christ*," not the doctrine of Christ. True faith is a spiritual communion; for in faith we receive not only the doctrine of Christ, but Himself, into us: in faith He Himself dwells in us: we cannot separate Christ, as Eternal Truth and His doctrine.—R.]

[BISHOP ANDREWES:—Ver. 14. If one be in debt and danger of the law, to have a brother of the same blood, made of the same woman, will little avail him, except he will come also "under the law," *i. e.*, become his surety, and undertake for him. And such was our estate. "The handwriting," our bond, we had forfeited. This debt of ours was no money debt, we were not *sub lege pecuniariâ*, but *capitalii;* and the debt of a capital law is death. He paid that to the full, and having paid it "blotted out the hand-writing," cancelled the sentence of the law.—R.]

[HENRY:—Ver. 1. We can think, and pray and be concerned for one another at the greatest distance; the communion of the saints is a spiritual thing.—Ver. 2. The prosperity of the soul is the best prosperity. Great knowledge and strong faith make a soul rich. The more intimate communion we have with our fellow Christians, the more the soul prospers.—Vers. 6, 7, a sovereign antidote against seducers.—They who pin their faith on other men's sleeves, and walk in the way of the world, are turned away from following after Christ.—It is not enough to put away some one particular sin, but we must put off the whole body of them.—We have communion with Christ in His whole undertaking. We are both buried and rise with Him, and both are signified by our baptism; not that there is anything in the sign or ceremony of baptism, which represent this burying and rising, any more than the crucifixion of Christ is represented by any visible resemblance in the Lord's Supper.—Christ's death was the death of our sins; Christ's resurrection is the quickening of our souls. The Redeemer conquered by dying. See His crown of thorns turned into a crown of laurels. Never had the Devil's kingdom such a mortal blow given to it, as was given by the Lord Jesus.—R.]

[BURKITT:—Ver. 1. The men of the world little understand, and less consider, what burthen of care lies upon the ministers of Christ, for, and on behalf of the whole Church of Christ in general, which is continually in danger of being corrupted by false teachers, who everywhere lie in wait to deceive.—Ver. 15. Christ's bloody cross was a chariot of triumph unto Him. Lord! whilst thou wert bleeding and racking upon the gibbet for us, thou wert then rejoicing and triumphing for the benefits redounding to us.—R.]

[EADIE:—Ver. 1. Like the caged bird beating its bared and bleeding breast against the wires of its prison, as it hears the repeated cry of its unseen young ones, the Apostle turned ever and anon toward those churches—nor did he idly chafe in his confinement, but he wrote this letter.—Ver. 4. The traveller who has already made some progress, but who begins gradually to doubt and debate, to lose faith in himself, and wonder whether he is in the right way at all, is prepared to listen to the suggestions of any one who, under semblance of disinterested friendship, may advise to a path of danger and ruin.—No philosophy ever dreamed of such an awful expedient as God robed in humanity, and in that nature dying to redeem His guilty creatures—whose name, nature and legal liabilities He had assumed: and such a scheme never found a place in any system of jurisprudence—what men have sought in deep and perplexing speculations on the order and origin of all things, they will find in this mystery.—The hallowed sphere of walk is "in Him," but beyond this barrier are sin and danger, false philosophies and mazy entanglements.—Any philosophy not "after Christ" must be earthly and delusive. It has missed the central truth—is amused with the stars, but forgetful of the sun.—Though the scar of circumcision might attest a nationality, it was no certificate of personal character—but wherever "the flesh" was parted with, there was the guarantee of individual purity and progress.—The nails which killed Christ pierced the sentence of doom,—gave egress to the blood which canceled it, and inflicted at the same time a mortal wound on the hosts of darkness.—R.]

[BARNES:—We should be on our guard against the seductive arts of false teachers. It is, in general, a safe rule for a Christian to abide by the views which he had on the great subjects of religion when he became converted (ver. 6). Then the heart was tender—there are some things in which the heart judges better than the head.—If at any time we can ascertain what are the prevalent views of Christ, we can easily see what is the prevailing character of the theology of that age.—Vers. 11–15. Christ has laid us under the highest obligations to serve Him. He has enabled us to put off our sins; He has raised us from spiritual death to spiritual life; He has removed the old ordinances that were against us, and has made religion easy and pleasant; He has subdued our enemies and triumphed over them.—R.]

5. Two special warnings.

(Chapter II. 16–23.)

16 Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink [in eating or in drinking],[1]
or in respect of a holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath *days* [of sabbaths]:[2]
17 Which[3] are a shadow of things to come; but the body *is* of Christ [Christ's].
18 Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility [arbitrarily in humility][4] and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not[5]
19 seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind [lit., the mind of his flesh], And not holding the Head, from which [whom][6] all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered [being supplied], and knit together, increaseth with the increase
20 of God. Wherefore [omit Wherefore][7] if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances,
21, 22 (Touch not; taste not; handle not; Which all are to perish with the using;) [for destruction in the consumption:][8] after the commandments and doctrines of men?
23 Which things have indeed a shew [repute] of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting [unsparingness][9] of the body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh [only to the satisfying of the flesh].[10]

1 Ver. 16.—[Βρώσει ἢ ἐν πόσει, the act of eating or of drinking. See Exeg. Notes. The reading is doubtful: ℵ. A. C. D. F. K. L. Rec. most versions; Lachmann, Tischendorf (ed. 7), Ellicott, Wordsworth read ἤ. B. Tischendorf (ed. 2), Alford, Braune: καί. The critical defence of the former reading is: "the common association of βρῶσις and πόσις would very naturally suggest the displacement of ἤ for the more usual καί"—of the latter: καί would readily be altered to ἤ to suit the rest of the sentence. Both are so plausible, that the reading ἤ can safely be adopted on uncial authority. As to the meaning as affected by the readings, see Exeg. Notes.—R.]

2 Ver. 16.—[Σαββάτων, literally "sabbaths," here=the singular.—R.]

3 Ver. 17.—ℵ A. D. E. F. read ἅ; B. has ὅ, which is to be preferred as the more difficult reading. [So Lachmann, Meyer. Alford is undecided, but gives ὅ in his text. Ellicott considers the reading ὅ not improbable, but insufficiently attested. Here also it is best to follow the mass of uncial MSS., with Rec. Tischendorf, and others. E. V. "which are" is correct in that case.—The reading Χριστοῦ (τοῦ omitted), Tischendorf, Ellicott, is preferable. Hence "Christ's," poss. gen. Eadie, Ellicott, Rhemish, Lachmann and Alford insert τοῦ (ℵ. A. B. C.).—R.]

4 Ver. 18.—[Θέλων. Braune renders "*willkürlich*." There is such diversity in interpretation that nothing more definite could be given in the text, and this will serve to show the one point of agreement among our modern commentators, *viz*, that the E. V. is incorrect.—R.]

5 Ver. 18.—Μή is added in ℵ., where it was originally wanting, as in A. B. and others; but it is not to be omitted, [Οὐκ is also found, but μή is the proper form of the negative here. See Exeg. Notes. The reading of Rec. has preponderant external authority, 6 MSS., nearly all cursives: supported by most versions, Tischendorf, Ellicott. Lachmann, Meyer, Alford reject the negative,—and this view affects the exegesis of the latter two.—R.]

6 Ver. 19.—[Ἐξ οὗ, masculine, Christ the Personal Head, hence "whom;" "which" in E. V. doubtless stands for "whom."—R.]

7 Ver. 20.—[Οὖν of Rec. and the article before Χρ. "have the authority of *all* the MSS. against them and are properly rejected by all modern editors" (Ellicott).—R.]

8 Ver. 22.—[The E. V. is indistinct,—the rendering given above presents the interpretation of Braune, Eadie, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth. The parenthesis should perhaps include this last clause only.—R.]

9 Ver. 23.—[Ἀφειδίᾳ, "unsparingness." So Eadie, Ellicott ("unsparing treatment"), Alford, Davies, and older English versions similarly.—R.]

10 Ver. 23.—[This is the interpretation of Braune, Meyer, Ellicott and others. See Exeg. Notes. More modifications might well be made, but this slight change sufficiently indicates the view upheld below.—R.]

[The text of this short passage, containing not less than 9 ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, is remarkably well established and free from variations.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The first warning, against a fleshly legality. Vers. 16, 17.

Vers. 16. **Let no man therefore judge you.**—Since the personality of the readers is strongly emphasized by the position of the words: τις ὑμᾶς in sharp contrast, "therefore" refers to what was said above (vers. 1–15), especially to their endowments and position in Christ: not merely however to the doing away of the Mosaic law (Meyer and others). Bengel: *ex. v.* 8–15 *deducitur igitur*. Κρίνειν means "to judge;" the connexion defines it more closely: allow no one the right to judge and to condemn you, if you do not respond to such demands. The warning is found in this,—permitting their action to be determined by this (Bleek). *Neminem, qui vos judicare conatur, audiatis* (Bengel). He treats of Christian, gospel freedom. Luther: Let no one make conscience for you (see also Rom. xiv. 22). It is not therefore=κατακρινέτω (Baehr).

In eating or in drinking.—Ἐν denotes the sphere, the point where the judgment was exercised, as Rom. ii. 1. Βρώσει and πόσει set forth the act of eating and drinking—food is

βρῶμα; drink, πόμα (Rom. xiv. 17; 2 Cor. ix. 10; 1 Cor. viii. 4; x. 4; Heb. ix. 10). As the Mosaic law had (Lev. vii. 10–27) prohibitions respecting food alone, and forbade wine only to the Nazarites (Numbers vi. 3), and during the time of priestly service (Levit. x. 9), the false teachers had certainly gone beyond this and heightened asceticism for Christians (Matt. xxiii. 24; Rom. xiv. 21). It is a false view, that there is here only a consonance without further significance (DE WETTE). Whether all indulgence in meat (OLSHAUSEN) or in wine (SCHENKEL) was forbidden, does not appear from the context.

Or in respect of a holyday, or of the new moon, or of sabbaths.—After "eating and drinking," joined with the copulative *καί*, the disjunctive union with ἤ follows, because the Apostle passes over to another matter. [It is true that eating and drinking may form one category, but in view of the doubtful reading, there is no sufficient critical or exegetical ground for preferring to make the above distinction.—R.] Ἐν μέρει, in respect of, in the point of (2 Cor. iii. 10; ix. 3; comp. WINER's *Gram.* p. 571), denotes the category, which includes the species: ἑορτῆς, *festum annum*, νουμηνίας, *in mense*, σαββάτων, *in hebdomade* (BENGEL); the diversity is indicated by ἤ instead of καί. The threefold order of 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; 2 Chron. ii. 4; xxxi. 3, is transposed. Comp. Gal. iv. 10. It is incorrect to apply it to *partial* observances of festivals (CHRYSOSTOM and others), or to make it=*vicibus festorum* (MELANCHTHON), or=*ne ulla quidem eorum ex parte* (SUICER); BEZA and others inexactly interpret by *respectu*. [The E. V. "in respect of" is exact enough, as it certainly suggests the idea of a category,=in the matter of.—R.] Christians should not permit themselves to be bound to Jewish festivals in their worship of God; neither to the three great annual feasts, nor the new moons, nor the Sabbath; σάββατα=σάββατον, Matt. xii. 1; Luke iv. 16; Acts xiii. 14; xvi. 13; it does not refer to the triple Sabbath (jubilee year, Sabbatic year, weekly Sabbath, HEUMANN [BARNES]). BENGEL: *hic significanter positus; nam sabbata dicuntur dies singuli hebdomados.* Thus IGNATIUS contends against the σαββατίζειν as well as against Judaism in the Epistle to the Magnesians, 9. [The passage reads in English: "no longer observing Sabbaths, but keeping the Lord's day."—EADIE:—"nor were they to hallow the 'Sabbaths,' for these had served their purpose, and the Lord's Day was now to be a season of loftier joy, as it commemorates a more august event than either the creation of the universe, or the exodus from Egypt. The new religion is too free and exuberant to be trained down to 'times and seasons' like its tame and rudimental predecessor. Its feast is daily, for every day is holy; its moon never wanes, and its serene tranquility is an unbroken Sabbath." The Jewish Sabbath was kept by the early Christians as well as the Lord's Day. The practice was condemned finally at a council in the neighboring city of Laodicea. —WORDSWORTH: "σαββάτων, the *Seventh Day* Sabbath, the Jewish Sabbath, which as far as it was the *seventh day Rest*, had been filled by Christ resting in the grave. The *position* of the day is changed, but the *proportion* remains unchanged, and has received new strength and sanction by its consecration to Christ under the gospel in the *Lord's* Day."—R.]

Ver. 17. **Which are a shadow of things to come.**—This verse is a proof of the warning. Ὅ [see critical notes; the meaning is the same if the reading ἅ be adopted.—R.] comprises all as a unit, and means: this (eating, drinking, feasts according to the precepts of the laws of Moses) is "a shadow of things to come." Σκιά, *umbra vitæ expers* (BENGEL), is not=σκιαγραφία, sketched in outline with charcoal, "*silhouette*" (CALVIN and others), since its antithesis here is not εἰκών, but σῶμα. It denotes the typical in the Mosaic law, not exactly the unsubstantialness (MEYER) or the transitoriness (SPENER), and not at all the darkness (MUSCULUS); for it gives certain intimation of the substance of the reality, and truth of the "things to come" (Heb. viii. 5; x. 1). Ἐστίν denotes the permanent nature of the former things; it is not=ἦν, but the commands and institutions have and retain a typical meaning. Τὰ μέλλοντα are future things, the things of αἰὼν μέλλων, not like this (SCHENKEL), nor is ἀγαθῶν to be supplied, from Heb. x. 1. These things cast a shadow into the αἰὼν οὗτος, so that the light, as well as the μέλλοντα, standing in the light, are before us. So long as one walks in the shadow, holds to it, he is not in the αἰὼν μέλλων, which began with the appearing of Christ, not to begin first with His *parousia* (MEYER); for there is added:

But the body is Christ's (WINER's *Gram.* p. 495).—This refers to the presence of the αἰὼν μέλλων, which had already entered. However, he, who still holds to the ordinances of the law, and allows himself to be governed by erring and erroneous men, not by Christ, does not hold to Him, is not yet in the Messianic kingdom and age, as he may and should be. The passage treats of a point of view rather than a point of time. See 1 Jno. ii. 8 [LANGE, *Comm.* p. 53.] "But the body" is in contrast with "shadow," fulfilment, full substance and life of "the things to come." Ἐστίν is to be joined to Χριστοῦ; to Him as Head and Lord (vers. 6, 19) it belongs; He has the direction of the "things to come," is the antithesis of τις (ver. 16). It is neither: *ad Christum pertinet, ab eo solo petenda est* (GROTIUS), *ex Christo pendet* (STORR), appeared in Christ (HUTHER), nor is σῶμα to be repeated with Χριστοῦ (BENGEL), certainly it is not=the Christian Church (SCHENKEL); as little is σκιά the Jewish Church. [WORDSWORTH: σῶμα is *substantial reality*. ALFORD incorrectly asserts that the Apostle could not thus have spoken, if the ordinance of the Sabbath had been, *in any form*, of lasting obligation in the Christian Church. Against this view, see ELLICOTT *in loco* and his references, also WORDSWORTH, Sermon 44, Christian Sunday.—R.] The joining of this clause to the following verse (Greek Fathers) is objectionable, because it obviously belongs to the antecedent context, and does not belong to ὑμᾶς.

Against superstitious worship of angels (vers. 18, 19).

Ver. 18. **Let no man beguile you of your reward.**—Μηδείς corresponds with μή τις, ver. 16, and introduces a warning. [EADIE remarks the uniform use of the singular in these

warnings, as contrasted with the plural used in Galatians. "Either he marks out one noted leader, or he merely individualizes for the sake of emphasis." Probably the latter.—R.] Here too the stress is laid upon the object ὑμᾶς, placed in an emphatic position. Καταβραβευέτω corresponds with κρινέτω (ver. 16). The word is rare, but Attic (*Demosthenes adv. Midiam, c.* 25), hence not a Cilician provincialism (JEROME); βραβεύειν is to be a βραβευς [*i. e.*, the awarder of prizes in the games.—R.], to perform such an office, παραβραβεύειν is to do this partially, unjustly, in favor of or against a competitor, καταβραβεύειν denotes definitely the hostile intent against one entitled to the prize. The prize (βραβεῖον, Phil. iii. 14: "of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus:" 1 Cor. ix. 24) is the imperishable crown (1 Cor. ix. 25) "of righteousness" (2 Tim. iv. 8; ii. 5), "of life" (Jas. i. 12), "of glory" (1 Pet. v. 4). Hence it is not to be interpreted as Christian freedom (GROTIUS) or the honor and prize of true Christian worship (DE WETTE), nor is the verb=κατακρίνειν (BAEHR and others). The following thought is not remote from, but not in, the passage; *Ne quis brabeutæ potestatem usurpans atque adeo potestate abutens, vos currentes moderetur perperamque præscribat, quid sequi; quid fugere debeatis, brabeum accepturi* (BENGEL—similarly BEZA). LUTHER is incorrect: let no one frustrate you in your aim; Vulgate also: *nemo vos seducat.*

Arbitrarily in humility and worshipping of angels.—Θέλων characterizes the design of the false teachers as to its ground. The participle denotes, what is joined to θρησκεία in the compound ἐθελοθρησκεία (ver. 23): the wilful desiring, having pleasure in "humility and worshipping of angels." Θέλειν ἐν is =חָפֵץ בְּ 1 Sam. xviii. 22; 2 Sam. xv. 26; Rom. x. 9; 2 Cor. ix. 8; Ps. cxlvii. 10. It is not to be complemented with τοῦτο or τοῦτο ποίειν (=καταβραβεύειν, MEYER). Nor is it to be explained *cupide* (ERASMUS). The former is both a pleonasm and brachylogy at once: the latter is contrary to usage. To join it with ἐμβατεύων (LUTHER) is inadmissible. [ELLICOTT follows MEYER and renders: "desiring to do it," but objects to any imputation of malice.—He characterizes the view supported by Braune (AUGUSTINE, OLSHAUSEN and many others) as distinctly untenable and contrary to all analogy of usage of θέλειν in the New Testament; yet his own interpretation is open to the objections made above. ALFORD renders: "of purpose," joining it with καταβραβευέτω, following THEOPHYLACT. The interpretation of MEYER, ELLICOTT, *et al.*, he deems "flat and spiritless;" that of Braune, he terms "a harsh Hebraism—irrelevant." If the view of θέλειν, given on p. 35, note, be correct, then Alford's interpretation is inadmissible. Braune's exegesis accords best with the distinction there made. They arbitrarily, spontaneously, from the evil impulses of their own nature, indulged in these things. This is relevant, for this made them dangerous.—R.] The context indicates that the first substantive, elsewhere used in a good sense (iii. 12; Eph. iv. 2; Phil. ii. 3; Acts xx. 19; 1 Pet. v. 5), has here a bad sense: false, affected humility, behind which much spiritual pride may hide. The other substantive (θρησκείᾳ) means worship, adoration, Jas. vi. 26, 27; Acts xxvi. 5 [E. V. "religion."—R.], the object of which is set forth by the genitive. Comp. Wisdom, xiv. 27; xi. 16; Maccab. v. 6. WINER's *Gram.* pp. 176, 233. In the Old Testament the angels repeatedly appeared as mediators between God and man, and as representatives of men with God (Job v. 1; xxx. 23; Zach. i. 12; Tobit xii. 15). In the Testimony of the VII. Patriarchs (PHILO) they appear as interceding, helping beings; among the later Jews the opinion is current, that the law was delivered to Moses through angels (BLEEK on Heb. ii. 2). The Fathers refer to the fact that the Jews supplicated angels and councils declare themselves on this point* (BÖHMER in *Herzog's Realencyclop.* 4. p. 31). [See EADIE *in loco.* It was at Colosse that special worship was given in after days to the archangel Michael, for an alleged miracle wrought by him, *viz.*, opening a chasm to receive the river Lycus. And at a council held in the neighboring city of Laodicea, the practice referred to in the text was condemned.—(CONYB. and HOWS Am. ed. II. p. 390, note 2).—R.]—"Humility" is to be regarded as so connected with angel worship, that the latter is proof of the former, since the mediation of angels was claimed in approaching God (THEODORET), or because the Majesty of the Only Begotten demanded it (CHRYSOSTOM). It is a mistake to take "humility" in a good sense, but as irony (STEIGER and others), or τῶν ἀγγέλων as *genitive subjecti* (LUTHER: spirituality of the angels, SCHLEIERMACHER, religion of the angels), or to weaken it to *studium singularis sanctitatis*, or to understand by it demons, demigods (ESTIUS). ["The Catholic interpreters, Estius and A-Lapide, make a strong effort to exclude this passage from such as might be brought against the worship of the saints" (EADIE), but the connection of the two substantives gives it a direct application to this error. —R.]

Intruding into those things which he hath not seen, ἃ μὴ ἑώρακεν [ἑόρακεν] ἐμβατεύων, is a further definition of καταβραβευέτω. The verb [participle] occurs only here; to step upon a place, hence spiritual regions through speculation; it is used of the entrance of the gods and their seating themselves (PASSOW *sub voce*); in distinction from ἐμβαίνειν, it denotes a confident, immediate stepping up, which the description of the regions entered (ἃ μὴ ἑόρακεν)—the transcendental—emphatic from position—shows to be unjustifiable. [The E. V. "intruding" is sufficiently accurate, though Braune's "*sich versteigend*" is more so.—R.] The negative μή instead of which οὐ occurs also, is correct in the relative clause after μηδείς (WINER's *Gram.* p. 448). Without the negative it may be referred to ὁράματα (Acts xx. 10, 12; x. 3); or ὁράσεις (Acts ii. 17) with MEYER: but if ὀφθείς (Acts ix. 17) must also be so understood according to the context, still ἃ ἑόρακεν (comp. 1 Jno. iv. 20) cannot be rightly referred to enthusiastic fancies. [These passages above cited speak of "visions;" to interpret thus would imply either that these visions were in themselves "illusions," or in their influence became "delusions." ALFORD

*[BARNES erroneously asserts: there is no evidence that any class of false teachers would deliberately teach that *angels* were to be worshipped.—R.]

renders: "standing on the things which he hath seen" *i. e.*, "an inhabitant of the realm of light, not of faith;" which as ELLICOTT observes "is ingenious, but not very plausible or satisfactory." The difficulty in such interpretations arises from following another than the true reading. The canon respecting *lectiones difficiliores* may be pushed too far.—R.]

Vainly puffed up by the mind of his flesh, is the third trait, more closely characterizing "humility." Εἰκῇ, *temere* (Rom. xiii. 4) or *frustra* (1 Cor. xv. 2; Gal. iii. 4; iv. 11), is here joined with φυσιούμενος in the former sense. [ELLICOTT: "bootlessly, without ground or reason." So Braune: "*ohne Ursache*." "Vainly" may imply vanity in the cause or the result; here the former.—R.] On account of its position it cannot be joined with ἐμβατεύων (STEIGER and others). His obscurity is groundless, since it rests upon his own mind, is caused by his own spirit (ὑπὸ τοῦ νοός), and the more so, since "the mind" (νοῦς) is determined by, entirely in the service of and belonging to, "the flesh" (τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ), which while unredeemed serves evil (Rom. vii. 14, 25), and commands the "mind," possesses and rules it, instead of being possessed and ruled by it. CHRYSOSTOM: ὑπὸ σαρκικῆς διανοίας [followed by the E. V., "fleshly mind."—MEYER: "It must be noticed that the matter is so represented that the σάρξ of the false teacher seems *personified* (comp. Rom. viii. 6), as though it had its own νοῦς, under the influence of which he is made proud. The *pride* of these people consisted in this, that with all their supposed humility, they allowed themselves to fancy, as is generally the case with fanatical tendencies, that they could not be satisfied with the simple knowledge and obeying of the gospel, but could attain to a peculiar, higher wisdom and sanctity."—R.]

Ver. 19. **And not holding the Head.**—This is the fourth trait to be connected with the "worshipping of angels," denying Christ and the church [*die Christlichkeit und Kirchlichkeit.*]—The object is Christ, to whom the false teachers did not hold fast as Head, hence as before and above all, angels as well. The negative οὐ, not μή as before, denotes a matter of fact (WINER'S *Gram.* p. 452). BENGEL: *Qui non unice Christum tenet, plane non tenet:* but he may yet belong to the church.—**From whom all the body** [or **the whole body**.—R.]—According to the parallel passage, Eph. iv. 15, ἐξ οὗ refers to Christ, hence is masculine, not neuter (MEYER) [So EADIE following MEYER: "not personally as Jesus, but really or objectively." But "the following verse seems to imply distinctly the contrary" (ELLICOTT).—R.] The preposition which is to be joined with αὔξει denotes the cause from which proceeds what it predicated, *viz.*, the growth, and not a remote one, only conditioning it from without, but indicating the most intimate vital connection between them. "All the body" includes the whole church (*Gemeinde*) without exception; there is no member that does not derive its growth from the Head. [It is a question whether the reference here is to the body in its entirety, or to the body as including every member. ELLICOTT and EADIE favor the former view, ALFORD and BRAUNE the latter, which is preferable, as the whole passage is against false teachers, who did not deny the unity of the church, but slighted the fact that each member "must hold fast the Head for himself" (ALFORD). There is then the greater reason for taking "from whom" personally. MEYER, followed by EADIE, refers ἐξ οὗ both to the verb and the participles, which reference does not correspond so well with the above views.—R.]

By joints and bands being supplied and knit together, διὰ τῶν ἁφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συνβιβαζόμενον, characterizes the body, the church, as Eph. iv. 16. The first participle belongs to ἁφῶν, the second to συνδέσμων. Both substantives, joined without a repetition of the article, form a category. Ἁφαί are the nerves, σύνδεσμοι the muscles: the former afford help, the latter compactness, firmness. Wherein the assistance consists is not expressly stated, the context only intimating vital activity in general (MEYER), not "nourishment" [E. V.] however, (GROTIUS). Ἁφαί do not refer to faith (BENGEL), σύνδεσμοι to prophets (THEODORET) or believers (BÖHMER), for faith is the life and the persons are the members.—[The fact that the two substantives are joined without a repetition of the article, is against the assignment of a participle to each. As ELLICOTT remarks: "The distinctions adopted by Meyer, *et al.*, according to which the ἁφαί are especially associated with ἐπιχορ., and referred to Faith, the συνδέσ. with συμβ., and referred to Love—are plausible, but perhaps scarcely to be relied upon. As in Eph. the passage does not seem so much to involve special metaphors, as to state forcibly and accumulatively a general truth."—In the parallel passage, Eph. iv. 16, Braune seems to interpret ἁφαί, "joints." To limit it specifically to "nerves," seems to be incorrect. EADIE: "We may understand it not merely of joints in the strict anatomical sense, but generally of all those means, by which none of the parts or organs of the body are found in isolation." He is not correct in giving a middle sense to ἐπιχορηγούμενον: "furnished with reciprocal aid." Both participles are passive; as present they denote "that the process is now going on" (ALFORD).—R.]

Increaseth with the increase of God, αὔξει τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ—[lit., "increaseth the increase of God." Accusative of cognate substantive and genitive *auctoris*.—R.] By this God is described as He who effects the growth from Christ (1 Cor. iii. 6, 12; vi. 18; WINER'S *Gram.* p. 232). The most appropriate preposition for Christ in this figure is ἐξ, for God ὑπό. Hence it does not refer to growth well-pleasing to God (CALVIN), [nor "godly growth," CONYBEARE and HOWSON.—R.] But the folly and danger of the false teachers is sharply marked.

Comprehensive conclusion. Vers. 20–23.

Ver. 20. **If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world.**—Sketch of their Christian state, in accordance with the context and the preceding passage (vers. 1–15). BENGEL: *continuatur illatio v.* 16 *coepta.* Εἰ is a rhetorical "if, as is actually the case" (WINER'S *Gram.* p. 418). There are here two definitions of "being dead:" how? "with Christ;" to what? "from the rudiments of the world." The

motive for "being dead" is given in vers. 11, 12, and for "with Christ" in ver. 19 (the Head) and vers. 10–15.* For the sake of distinctness, and at the same time to mark the "dying" as an emancipation (BENGEL: *concise: mortui et sic liberati ab elementis*), the preposition ἀπό is repeated from the verb, where otherwise the dative would be found (Gal. ii. 19; Rom. vi. 2). "The rudiments of the world" are here those rudiments in which they lived before they became "in Christ," when they were still heathen; they should not fall away into such again, seduced by Judaistic false teachers. See on ver. 8.—MEYER incorrectly supposes that Christ also was "dead from the rudiments;" he overlooks that Gentile Christians are referred to; Christ is indeed "the end of the law," but has not to die to it.

Why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances?—"Why" introduces, emphatically in the form of a question, the conclusion that it was wrong. Comp. Gal. iv. 8–10. "As living in the world," like "when we were in the flesh" (Rom. vii. 5), describes their standpoint before conversion, to which they are returning; ὡς denotes the justifiable conclusion and comparison=*quippe qui*, "as though." Δογματίζεσθε is the middle (LUTHER: why do ye allow yourselves to be caught with ordinances?); the verb is=δόγμα τιθέναι, like νομοθετεῖν. It can be neither: one decrees to you (MEYER);* nor: you lay ordinances upon yourselves (BLEEK); they did not do this, nor does it correspond with the situation, while the former does not correspond with the intention of the intensive question, as if it concerned only a sketch of the fact, and not a rousing of the readers against it.

These ordinances are now noted concretely as to their purport: Ver. 21. **Touch not, taste not, handle not,** μὴ ἅψῃ, μηδὲ γεύσῃ, μηδὲ θίγῃς.—The triple reference forming a climax, marks the urgency of the demand for abstinence (MEYER). The reference to ver. 16 allows the omission of the objects, meat and drink, which are required by the second verb γεύσῃ. It is incorrect to apply "touch not" to sexual pleasure (FLATT); this cannot be justified by 1 Cor. vii. 1; 1 Tim. iv. 3, against the context, *viz.*, the former part of ver. 22. The suppression of the object is not to be accounted for by the fear and dissimulation of the false teachers, who did not name it themselves (STEIGER), nor thus: that Paul had not thought on any definite object. The objects he sets forth in paraphrase:

Ver. 22. **Which all are for destruction in the consumption,** ἅ ἐστιν πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει.—This relative clause sketches the forbidden objects, all of them (ἅ—πάντα); ἐστιν, placed first for emphasis, denotes that their nature is,—"appointed to destruction, perishable" (εἰς φθοράν), by being used up (τῇ ἀποχρήσει). This verdict reminds us of Matth. xv. 17; Mark vii. 18, 19; 1 Cor. vi. 13. Hence these words must be considered the Apostle's judgment to show, and that not without irony, the perversity of the notion, that through eating and drinking moral detriment originated (CHRYSOSTOM: εἰς κόπρον γὰρ ἅπαντα μεταβάλλεται). They cannot be regarded as the words of the false teachers (VATABLE, SCHENKEL), who will not suffer them to be touched, nor as parenthesis* (MEYER). Nor is ἅ to be referred to δόγματα, implied in δογματίζεσθε above (AUGUSTINE [BARNES] and others), nor is εἰς φθοράν to be explained as moral corruption (DE WETTE), since it merely describes destruction, decomposition, here of sensuous things. Although ἀποχρήσει must not be taken as the simple noun, it must however be distinguished from παράχρησις and κατάχρησις, "abuse." [The view Braune upholds is so generally adopted by modern commentators and so far preferable that it seems unnecessary to notice the others particularly. The practical bearing of the passage is obvious to any, who discover its true meaning. That this true meaning has not always been discovered by American Christians is evident from the fact that some still cite: "Touch not, taste not, handle not," in support of "total abstinence" from beverages which can intoxicate. Whatever may be the expediency of such a principle, it is one against which, as a binding rule of universal application, this passage, rightly interpreted, *might* be used. To use it in its favor is contrary to all fair dealing with the word of God,—a wresting of the Scripture, excusable only on the ground of ignorance, if in these days such ignorance be not rather an aggravation.—R.]

After the commandments and doctrines of men, κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, sets forth a modality of δογματίζεσθε, marking it as in contrast with God's law and word in Christ, indeed with the law of Moses, beyond which they have gone. "Doctrines" is added in justification of "commandments;" the latter are more restricted, the former more extended; the latter are results, the former set forth the premises and consequences. Matt. xv. 7; Mark vii. 7. [ELLICOTT: they were submitting to a δογματισμός not only in its preceptive, but even in its doctrinal aspects.—R.]

Ver. 23. **Which things have indeed a repute of wisdom.**—"Which things" refers to "commandments and doctrines of men," and denotes, not single commandments, *etc.*, but the whole category of human ordinances. Ἐστὶν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας is a concession (μέν), to which the antithesis (δέ) is wanting; still to the very significant λόγος we have the correlate τιμῇ, to λόγον ἔχοντα corresponds ἐν τιμῇ τινι, and on this account to μέν the following οὐκ corresponds. Hence λόγος here must mean "report," as Luke v. 15; Jno. xxi. 23; Acts xi. 22. So Herodot. 5, 66 (GRIMM, *Clavis, sub voce* p. 260). CHRYSOSTOM: λόγον φησὶν, οὐ δύναμιν, ἄρα οὐκ ἀλήθειαν. The Vulgate therefore: *rationem*

* [MEYER (followed by ALFORD) regards the verb as passive, finding here, not a reproach but a warning of the readers, who have not yet been led away. In that case, "as living in the world" indicates the wrong view which the false teachers take of the Christian position. There is much force in his objection to the common view, as implying that they were living as if in the world, a reproach which does not correspond with the tone of the rest of the Epistle. However the implication may only be, that if they allowed this to continue, they would be returning to the world.—R.]

* [The parenthesis of the E. V. seems unnecessary. It was probably designed to connect "ordinances" and "after the commandments of men" more closely. If any clause be parenthetical, it is this one, and MEYER, ALFORD and ELLICOTT so regard it, agreeing entirely, however, with the exegesis of Braune.—R.]

habentia, and LUTHER: "appearance" [E. V.: "show"] are incorrect. [ALFORD: "possessed of a reputation,"—ELLICOTT: "do have the repute"—are enjoying the repute of wisdom.—R.] The omission of a clause introduced by δέ is an anacoluthon, but not strange, since the clause is unmistakable (WINER's *Gram.* p. 535). Ἐστὶν ἔχοντα is used instead of ἔχουσιν, to mark the weakness of men in permitting themselves to be so readily deceived and blinded, and contains a charge against such in general rather than against those in Colosse. Bengel improperly joins ἐστίν with πρὸς πλησμονήν, and resolves ἔχοντα into: *cum habeant, ut sit incisum;* so SCHENKEL also.

In will-worship, and humility, and unsparingness of the body, ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ ἀφειδίᾳ τοῦ σώματος.—"In," standing only at the beginning, denotes that all three belong together. Compounds with ἐθελο are frequent (see Passow's Lexicon) and describe, according to the word, something done freely, voluntarily, on one's own responsibility, arbitrarily, factitiously, affectedly; ἐθελοθρησκεία is self-imposed, arbitrary worship (ver. 18). The object is not added, because self-evident: God. The false teachers in question would worship Him through the mediation of the adoration of angels. Compare ἐθελοπερισσοθρησκεία, by which EPIPHANIUS (*haer.* 1, 16) describes the piety of the Pharisees. Ταπεινοφροσύνη, as in ver. 18, denotes the humility which appeared with ostentation, hence only apparent, external. Ἀφειδία σώματος denotes the unsparing austerity towards the body through ascetic abstinence. Such mortification is based upon contempt of the creatures, false views of matter as the seat of sin. The first substantive denotes the religious aspect of their conduct, the second, the moral in relation to men, the third, the same as respects earthly things. In such ways they gained a repute of wisdom.

In opposition to this repute, the Apostle adds his judgment: **not in any honour,** οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι. Here belongs ἐστίν, which follows ἅτινα, in order to contrast with "the repute of wisdom among the people," the Apostle's judgment, *viz.:* the repute is without honorable grounds, without true honor. This is strongly affirmed; there is nothing at all in it which is really honorable; hence "in any honor" is a sharp negation (οὐκ) of will-worship, humility and unsparingness of the body.—To this negative Paul adds a positive statement: **[only] to the satisfying of the flesh,** πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός.—The former clause denies "the repute of wisdom" as a just repute; this gives a motive for the negation, in connexion with "unsparingness of the body." The false doctrine tends (πρός) to a satisfying (in contrast with "unsparingness") of the fleshly nature (τῆς σαρκός opposed to σώματος). It is incorrect to render: "not giving to the flesh the honor due to its necessities" (LUTHER and others). Πλησμονή implies blame (BENGEL: *fere excessum denotat*) and cannot= πρόνοια (Rom. xiii. 14). The distinction between τοῦ σώματος and τῆς σαρκός, and the omission of τοῦ σώματος after ἐν τιμῇ τινι must not be overlooked. GROTIUS singularly deduces praise from this: *habent ista rationem non stultam, si adsint cautiones, si sponte ista suscipiantur non abominando ea, quæ deus creavit,—cum ea modestia animi, quæ alios aliter viventes non damnet,—si hoc sibi propositum habeant, dure tractare corpus neque carni obsequi ad saturitatem.*—[Braune's view is that of MEYER, and is to be preferred, 1) as least ungrammatical; 2) as giving the best correlate to μέν; 3) preserving the distinction between σῶμα and σάρξ; 4) bringing out the bad sense of πλησμονήν and thus conveying the sharp condemnation, that asceticism, while it appears to subdue the body, serves only to gratify the flesh and its evil nature. For other interpretations see EADIE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT. The latter agrees most nearly with Braune.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Fasts* and *Feasts* are placed together by the Apostle (ver. 16), while as a rule fasting and prayer occur together; Acts xiii. 3: "when they had fasted and prayed;" xiv. 23: "prayed with fasting;" 1 Cor. vii. 5: "fasting and prayer" (A. B. however omit the former). He forbids the one or the other, as little as Christ (Matt. vi. 5, 16); he does not annul the decree of the apostolic council (Acts xv. 20, 28), in which also the ethical and ritual are united. But he opposes *first*, asceticism which extends to "unsparingness of the body," *secondly*, an arbitrary abstinence from the means of nourishment ordained for eating and drinking, demanded equally from all, *thirdly*, those fasts connected with certain arbitrarily chosen days in the year, month and week. He thus opposes that *dualistic* view of the world, which does not regard and treat matter as the creature of God, which undervalues the body and its life, and in spite of its "unsparingness of the body" serves only "to the satisfying of the flesh;" he demands the maintenance of individual freedom and would commit all abstinence to the free moral resolution (as Rom. xiv. 2 sq., 1 Cor. viii. 1 sq., 1 Tim. iv. 3), and—as far as such abstinence is justified, and may be occasioned or required by internal or external circumstances, by the discipline necessary for the individual, or occurrences that affect him,—he would not have it mechanically and arbitrarily bound to special days, least of all that it should be regarded as of moral merit or as a work of supererogation, transcending or retrieving the purely moral law and moral conduct of life. The Christian should not bind his conscience to men, but only to God's word and God's law. Holy days and seasons should be determined by the great facts of salvation and the great acts of God, and not arbitrarily chosen. Thus we must judge both the Romish worship overrun with fasts and saints' days, and the Methodist and Baptist sects adhering to the Reformed Church. [The author, being a Lutheran, refers to the entire neglect of even such anniversaries as Christmas, Easter and Pentecost.—The special reference to the Methodists and Baptists must be confined to Germany,—and indeed in this country there is no applicability in his allusion to their adherence to the Reformed Church. It is true that until lately the prevailing practice of many churches in America would fall under the condemnation he hints at, and even now these historic days are observed

socially rather than religiously, as holidays rather than holy days. The Lord's Day has always been kept in a truer position. I may add that "fasting" is practically ignored as a Christian duty from extreme antagonism to arbitrary fast days, but while the American Church has allowed "no man to judge" "in eating," it has permitted strict judgment "in drinking" to lay a burden on the conscience. Paul places both in the same category (ver. 16). However expedient abstinence may be, this passage (vers. 16, 20–23) forbids the infringement on Christian freedom which is quite common.—R.]

2. *The distinction and the connexion of the Old and New Testament* economy are here described. The former is "the shadow of things to come" (ver. 17) and "the rudiments of the world" (ver. 20), which are given in heathenism as well as Judaism; contrasted with the former, the New Testament economy is "the body," with the latter it is "perfection" (τελείωσις). Christianity is called "the power of God and wisdom of God" (1 Cor. i. 24), at once to distinguish it from Judaism and to describe it as pre-announced, pre-intimated, prepared for in the same. The law is done away, not because it is in itself of no value, but because man is unable to fulfil it, obtains only in Christ, what he cannot attain without Him through the law. See Schmid, *Bibl. Theol.* II. 233–235; 322–325. Catholic and Reformed confessions fail in this respect; they regard the gospel as a *nova lex*, and permit the distinction between the Old Testament and New Testament to fall into the background: the former is pharisaical, the latter spiritualistic. [The position of the law in the Reformed confession does not seem to me to warrant this remark. See the Heidelberg Catechism, Ques. 2, 91, 92. Belgic conf., xxiv. xxv. Perhaps others are more open to this charge. See also Form of Concord, VI.—R.]

[3. *The observance of the Lord's Day* cannot be affected by the warning of Paul (ver. 16). It is certain that the persons who were judging them, were pressing the duty of observing the Jewish Sabbath, not the Christian Lord's Day. It is equally certain that the observance of a weekly day of rest is written in God's physical and social laws for man, as plainly as in the Decalogue. Nor can we escape the conclusion that the fourth Commandment is but a reminder of a previous institution, so that even those who might contend that the whole Mosaic law is abrogated, as a guide to Christian life, do not escape this enactment. But since the Christian would live gratefully, he still finds the rule in God's "holy, just and good" moral law, and sees in his very frame as well as in the frame-work of society, an additional reason for appropriating to "rest in God's service," one day in seven, rejoicing therein, since it now marks the great fact of his Lord's resurrection, and since his Master has Himself explained how it should be observed. —R.]

4. *The importance of the doctrine respecting angels* (Philippi: *Kirchl. Glaubenslehre* I. p. 279 sq.), without which the doctrine respecting Satan remains incomprehensible, is as great as the danger from the rationalistic denial of angels, springing from a Sadduceean view of the world, and the Romish adoration of angels, growing out of Essenic and dualistic heresy. The latter soon appeared in the Church. In Laodicea (at the council held between 343 and 381), it was forbidden in the 35th Canon. Ambrose first encouraged it (*observandi sunt angeli*). Augustine warns against it: *imitandos eos potius, quam invocandos*, and refers to the distinction between *cultus religiosus* and *non religiosus*. This, the second council of Nicæa (787) turned in favor of the adoration of angels, and the distinction established between λατρεία, invocation, and τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις, δουλεία, pious veneration, must now serve as a support for the heathenish adoration of angels and worship of the saints (*Conc. trid. sess.* 25. *Cat. Rom.* 3. 2; 8. 10). Our symbols maintain: *angelos a nobis non esse invocandos, adorandos* (*Articles of Schmalkald* II. 2). [See Reformed Confessions and catechisms generally.—R.]

5. *Christ the Head of the Church*, is for her the foundation of all religious and moral life: she needs no other mediator with God.—

6. *The Church is a living organism*, not an establishment or institution. It is a unity of many members; it rests upon an act and work of God in Christ, is from God and to God, has as its end education for perfection and glory hereafter; and possesses, in the word and sacraments and the proper administration of the same, suitable means for the attainment of this end. As to its inmost being, it is a vital relation of the congregation [*Gemeinde*] to the ever present, spiritual-physically present Lord (Harless. *Ethik.* 6. *Aufl.* p. 564). [By "*Geistleiblich*"—which is untranslatable, Braune means the presence of Christ in the eucharist according to the Lutheran view. Vital union with Christ the Head is not less insisted upon by those who hold the really Calvinistic view.—R.] It is an organization (but not the source), for the facilitating and furthering of *Christliness* [*Christlichkeit*], and the sense of this fellowship founded and maintained by Christ with the corresponding conduct is *Churchliness* [*Kirchlichkeit*], which is indissolubly connected with Christliness. As Church and Churchdom [*Kirche und Kirchenthum*] are so distinguished, that the former, as a Divine act, legally and rightly, takes form in the latter, so there is a two-fold Churchliness; one holding fast to the revelation of grace and ordinance of salvation in Christ, the other adhering to the legal forms of a special Churchdom, which has been and is being humanly and historically developed. The former has its source in the invisible Church, the fellowship of the Spirit, the latter in the visible church, which is the fellowship of law, and hence only human, secondary, accessory; it is not the realization of the idea of the Church, but merely a help and external support (Stahl: *Rechts-und Staats lehre*, p. 164). All ecclesiastical canons *non imprimunt credenda, sed exprimunt credita.* But in thus distinguishing, rightly, the ordinances of salvation and of the Church, Christliness and Churchliness, and the latter again in this two-fold manner, care must be taken not to undervalue the latter, as well as not to overvalue it.

7. *The principle of Christian liberty* especially and of Christian life in general is, that one neither makes nor permits to be made an arbitrary law, and so exercises his Christianity upon all that is created, ordinances as well as gifts, that

the creature is used in humble obedience to God's will, without the fleshly nature exalting itself. Asceticism degenerates into mere mechanical morality, casuistic hair-splitting about the divine law, an externalizing of self-discipline and self-exertion, a stirring up of spiritual pride. Under austerity respecting externals is concealed effeminacy with regard to heart-emotions, and in the unsparing plaguing of the body the flesh is fondled.

[8. *The connection of the two warnings.* There is instruction in the connection of precepts in Paul's writings. Here are two warnings, one against fleshly legality, the other against worship of angels, both condemned as having a "show of wisdom"—but tending only to the satisfying of the flesh. The connection is not obvious, yet side by side the two errors have existed with the same result. In germ at Colosse, in full flower in the medieval church, and in modern times, in America especially, fanatical binding of the conscience respecting articles of diet and drink, and "intruding into things not seen," craving for other "spiritual manifestations" than those coming from the Head, have taken root and flourished in the same localities, together with "a show of wisdom" and an intense "satisfying of the flesh." Error has its affinities and its unchanging law of development no less than truth.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Christ wants no legal man, who through zeal in good works will earn the love of God, but a spiritual man, whose faith through grateful love to God is diligent in every good word and work.—In winter fruit trees look more alike than in spring, summer and autumn; where life and liberty are wanting, there is monotony in faith and walk; while lifeless liberty makes every diversity prominent.

STARKE:—That is the devil's way, to judge and make conscience where none should be made, and to make none where it should be. Let us hold to Christ alone, and put no man or creature as mediator with Him; but hold to Him truly too, so that we have His witness, whether we have received of His Spirit to abide in us.—Will worship is worthless.

RIEGER:—Sincerity, which seeks God and clings to His Word, seizing salvation in Christ, as if it were I only in the world, whom it concerned; unity, joining itself to all who are called and pressing to the same goal with the same serviceableness; freedom, which binds and is bound by none in things that can neither hinder nor further me in the ordained course.—Each one has a corner in his heart where rash prejudices can hide, to break out swiftly in natural and spiritual things, so that we can quickly stumble at one thing, or thoughtlessly depreciate another.—[Self-will makes even humility, a vain puffing up.—R.]

GERLACH:—While one lives in the world, he serves its rudiments. Of these God made use in His law to typify in that time of childhood higher, eternal truths. But when the full light of truth has risen, to serve these is to be in bondage to the world. All this is renewed in Christendom, whenever Christ, as the only Mediator is supplanted or thrown into the background by other sub-mediators.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—The right way can only be the one way, in the likeness of the Divine Love to maintain the bond of love among each other, and in common with those who are our brethren to seek and to lead a spiritual life.—[The difficult wisdom of the gospel, which so few attain: rightly distinguishing the internal from the external, substance from shadow, spirit from letter.—R.]

PASSAVANT:—Habit and custom, the regular return of religious exercises and festivals, regular Sabbaths, periodical communion seasons, even set hours of meditations, even family worship otherwise so necessary in addition to public worship,—how easily do all degenerate into empty form and external posture without spirit and life.—He who does not hold to the Head, but holds rather to the thoughts of his own wisdom and the dreams of his own fancy, relying upon systems of human philosophy, upon highly gifted minds, or on the poesy of the human imagination, desiring to seek and find there all that is noble and exalted, salvation, joy, heaven itself, thereby denies and disowns the one great Reconciler and Redeemer, His Truth, His Love, His Right and His Glory: he loses in his folly and ingratitude the whole wealth of the Word of God; he takes the shadow instead of the body, the sheen for the true light, a self-made life for the true Life, God's Life in us.

HEUBNER:—The Christian should maintain freedom of conscience. He should not depend on others, but follow his own conscience, not permitting himself to be bound to non-essential exercises. A superstitious over-estimate of things indifferent always leads away from Christ.—*Young Stilling*, although indulging in many fancies about spirits, remained faithful to the biblical principle, that all such attempts to open up the invisible world about him are culpable and opposed to the present probationary state of man. A Christian, clinging to Christ is secure against all such foolery, which would divert him from his aim.

WILHELM.—The holy simplicity of the Christian. It consists herein 1) that he keeps his goal uninterruptedly in view: 2) guards against all going according to his own choice: 3) studies true humility at heart.—LEHMAN:—Against what must we guard if we would not miss the mark of our heavenly calling? 1) Against our own choice in the matter of our blessedness; 2) against false humility; 3) against carnal mind. CLAUS:—Two great dangers on the path to the heavenly goal; 1) the error of human ordinances; 2) the pride of our own heart.

[BURKITT:—Abstinence is sinful when men abstain from some meats, upon pretence of holiness and conscience, as if some meats were unclean, or less holy in their own nature than others, or as if simple abstinence at any time were a thing acceptable to God in itself, without respect to the end for which it is sometimes required.—Men are most forward to that service of God, which is of man's finding out and setting up; man likes it better to worship a God of his own making, than to worship the God that made

him; and likes any way of worshipping God which is of his own framing, more than that which is of God's appointing.—HENRY: Ver. 19. 1) Jesus Christ is not only a Head of Government over the church, but a Head of vital influence to it. 2) The body of Christ is a growing body.—R.]

[EADIE:—Ver. 16. Sensations of spiritual joy are not to be restricted to holy days, for they thrill the spirit every moment, and need not wait for expression till there be a solemn gathering, for every instant awakes to the claims and the raptures of religion.—Ver. 19. The church can enjoy neither life nor growth, if, misunderstanding Christ's person or undervaluing His work, it have no vital union with Him.—Ver. 20. Christ is the Head and to Him alone do we owe subjection.

> What mean they? Canst thou dream there is a power
> In lighter diet at a later hour
> To charm to sleep the threatenings of the skies,
> And hide past folly from all-seeing eyes? (COWPER).

Ver. 23. When Diogenes lifted his foot on Plato's velvet cushion and shouted "thus I trample on Plato's pride," the Athenian sage justly replied "but with still greater pride." The Apostle utters a similar sentiment. These corporeal macerations, as history has shown tend to nurse licentiousness in one age, and a ferocious fanaticism in another.—R.]

[BARNES:—Ver. 16. It is the solemn and sacred duty of all Christians to remit all attempts to make ceremonial observances binding on the conscience.—Ver. 18. "Pride may be pampered while the flesh grows lean."—WORDSWORTH: Ver. 18. Pride in its worst form; Pride dressed up in the disguise of lowliness. And this is the besetting sin of the human heart, which is more puffed up by false humility than by open pride.—R.]

[SCHENKEL:—The danger of constituting oneself a judge of the consciences of others; 1) why it is so near us; 2) why it must be so earnestly contended against.—Christ the only mediator between God and man: It is not humility, but pride, if we seek another.—The officious seeking after revelations outside the Revelation: 1) how dangerous; 2) how foolish it is.—The danger of spiritual pride; 1) Its source—the flesh; 2) its effects—inflation.—Who has died with Christ, can no longer live in the world: 1) The reason, 2) the power of this truth.—Will-worship: 1) a self-deception, 2) a deceiving of others.—Interference with allowable enjoyment by ordinances of men: 1) the *wrong* inherent in such interference; 2) the *impurity* to which it leads.—R.]

III. PART SECOND.

Exhortation to vital sanctification.

CHAPTERS III. 1—IV. 6.

1. The foundation and prospect of a genuine Christian mind and walk.

(CHAP. III. 1–4.)

1 If ye then be risen [were raised together][1] with Christ, seek those things which are
2 above, where Christ sitteth [is, sitting] on the right hand of God. Set your affection
3 [mind] on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead[2] [died] and
4 your life is [or hath been] hid [κέκρυπται] with Christ in God. When Christ, *who is* our life,[3] shall appear [or be manifested], then shall ye also appear [or be manifested] with him in glory.

[1] Ver. 1.—[So Ellicott, Alford. The former renders the whole verse: "If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is, sitting on the right hand of God," which rendering is justified in the notes below. His note on the distinction between "which" and "that" is interesting.—R.]

[2] Ver. 3.—['Απεθάνετε; aorist, referring to definite past time, hence: "died"—as in ver. 1: "were raised."—R.]

[3] Ver. 4.—ℵ. C. D.[1] E.[1] F. G. and others read ὑμῶν; while B. and many others have ἡμῶν. A. has a *lacuna* here. The authorities are equal, the internal grounds also; the former is more striking, fitting, the latter the stranger, more difficult reading; not like the other dependent on ver. 3. Certainly it cannot be referred merely to Paul and Timothy (Schenkel), but to Christians in general. [Braune, following Meyer, seems to prefer ὑμῶν; but with Rec., Lachmann, Tischendorf, and modern English editors, ἡμῶν ("our," E. V.) is to be preferred.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The injunction. Vers. 1, 2.

Ver. 1. **If ye then were raised together with Christ** takes up from the foregoing (ii. 12) a comprehensive thought, in a form reminding us of ii. 20, to make it the basis of the exhortation. "If," like ii. 20, is not a doubtful hypothesis, but fact (ii. 12), from which, as undeniable, a certain conclusion is deduced (οὖν). By "raised together with Christ" we must understand the ethical renewal (see notes on ii. 12). MEYER, who apparently refers this also to the

corporeal resurrection, overlooks the "shall be manifested" (ver. 4), and errs in regarding "actual" and "objective" as identical notions in contrast with "ethical;" this latter is no less actual. [ALFORD, ELLICOTT, WORDSWORTH refer the aorist to "baptism." It refers to the definite point of time when this actual, "ethical" change took place. Is that necessarily at baptism? The two former object to the ethical sense on the ground that the injunction which follows would then be superfluous. Why should not a motive be drawn from this? What has been done for them is the ground for their doing, "seeking."—R.]

Seek those things which are above.—Τὰ ἄνω, placed first for emphasis, is like τὰ ἐπουράνια (Eph. ii. 6); to seek such things is a necessary consequence and requirement of being "raised together with Christ." BENGEL: *Christus a resurrectione statim contendit ad cœlum* (Jno. xx. 17). Comp. Phil. iii. 14, 20; Matt. vi. 20, 23; Rom. ii. 7.—**Where Christ is, sitting at the right hand of God.**—"Where" marks "the things above" as the region of the heavenly things of the Messianic salvation; "Christ is, sitting at the right hand of God" indicates both the exultation after deep humiliation and certain rest after severe conflict. Thus a motive is given for the exhortation. Comp. Ps. cx. 1. [The passage seems to abound in motives, though this is the principal one. The E. V. overlooks the fact that there are two enunciations: "Christ is there, and in all the glory of His regal and judiciary power" (ELLICOTT).—R.]

Ver. 2. **Set your mind on things above.**—The emphasis rests on the object; hence it is placed first here also. This is not mere repetition. After "seek" (ζητεῖν), which manifests itself in active and outward conduct, prominence is given to the cogitations of thought (φρονεῖν, Phil. iii. 15, 19). BENGEL: *qui vere suprema quærunt, non possunt non sapere suprema.*—**Not on things on the earth.**—This is=τὰ ἐπίγεια, "earthly things" (Phil. iii. 19), τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, "the things that are in the world" (1 Jno. ii. 15). The earthly, that which is "to perish with the using" (ii. 22), should not be the object of inward care and thought; this is a sign of being "of the world," which is not=being "in the world" (Jno. xvii. 14, 16, 12). The use of earthly things is not forbidden, but we are bidden, in the right use of the earthly to mind and seek heavenly things. [THEOPHILUS: Four-footed beasts are like images of men who *mind earthly things;* but they who live righteous lives soar aloft, like birds, on the wings of the soul, and *mind those things that are above* (WORDSWORTH).—R.]

Ver. 3. *The Proof.* **For ye died**, *i. e.*, died to the world, to the earth (ii. 20: "from the rudiments of the world"). The aorist (ἀπεθάνετε) is used to denote an act that has occurred. Ye cannot then go backwards, live again or longer after the former fashion: your life is now another one.—**And your life is hid with Christ in God.**—"And" adds to the negative side, the having died, the positive side, "your life," which however is "hid." The perfect (κέκρυπται) denotes the continued relation, the verb itself marks the state of the existent life as still hidden, of course from the world, from men, from themselves also (1 Jno. iii. 2: "It doth not yet appear"): the coherence of the life of Christians is denoted by "with Christ," the inherence by "in God" (MEYER). Comp. 1 Pet. iii. 4: "the hidden man of the heart;" Acts xvii. 28: "in Him we live and move and have our being." [EADIE, against BARNES: "the idea of concealment, and not that of security, seems to be principally contained in the verb, for it is placed in contrast with open manifestation of Christ's appearance. But this concealment is no argument against present and partial enjoyment."—R.]—Evidently this is to be understood of eternal life, which has been awakened and is furthered in the present in consequence of the new birth. It remains concealed until its completion, which enters (ver 4; Rom. viii. 19) with "the coming" (2 Thess. i. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 14; 1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7) of its Author and Finisher, Christ. The Greek fathers, CALVIN, GROTIUS, MEYER, incorrectly regard it as the life hereafter, [ALFORD: the resurrection life—R.], as if the Christian life were not already substantially, though incipiently, the life to be completed hereafter. GROTIUS is incorrect, *jus ad rem rei nomine appellat;* HEINRICH: *sicuti Christus;* ROSENMUELLER: *in mente dei.* [ALFORD: notice the solemnity of the repetition of the articles; and so all through these verses.—R.]

Ver. 4. *The exalted prospect.* **When Christ shall appear.**—Rapidly, without καί or δέ, this reminder and prospect is added, to animate their zeal. "When" marks the time, viz.: the appearing of Christ.—**Our life**—[the E. V. inserts "*who is*," thus bringing out the force of the passage.—R.] This is in apposition with "Christ," as "the hope of glory" (i. 27). It forms the basis of the conclusion ("then shall ye also appear"); hence it is added to signify not merely that Christ is a remote and sundered Cause, but Impulse, Power, Object and Substance of the Life itself (Phil. i. 21; Jno. xi. 25). BENGEL: *Ratio sub qua manifestabitur.* [EADIE is unfortunate in his interpretation: "shall appear in the character of our life." Christ is our life itself, the essence and the impersonation of it (ELLICOTT).—R.]

Then shall ye also appear with him in glory.—"Then" refers to "when" (BENGEL. *prius non debemus postulare*); "ye also" to "Christ." [ELLICOTT: The more verbally exact opposition would have been "your hidden life;" but this the Apostle perhaps designedly neglects, to prevent ζωή being applied as it has been applied, merely to the resurrection-life.—R.] "With Him," which might otherwise have been omitted, is emphatic. "Appear with Him in glory" is="glorified together" (Rom. viii. 17), there preceded by "suffer with Him," as this is by "died" (ver. 3; ii. 20: "with Christ"). Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 42–44, 53.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Here and hereafter* no more fall into two incongruous parts, than the year with seed time and harvest, human life with childhood and riper age, man with body and soul, the church in in-

visibly visible manner, with its militant and triumphant congregations. It is more than indistinctness and superficiality, it is anti-christian error to say, as does Kaüffer (*De ζωῆς αἰωνίου notione*, p. 93): *vitam enim piam et honestam, quam homo Christianus in hac terra vivere possit ac debeat, Paulus dicere non poterat nunc cum Christo in deo* (*in cœlis puta, in quibus Christus nunc est*) *reconditam esse, atque olim in splendido Jesu reditu de cœlo revelatam iri: hæc nonnisi vitæ cœlesti conveniunt.* Such an affirmation grossly offends against the Lord's words (Jno. v. 24, "hath eternal life") and Paul's (Phil. iii. 20: "our conversation is in heaven). So "ethical" and "physical" are very different, but not incongruous ideas. The Ethos should become Physis, and the latter should be made ethical. The Hereafter is not locally separated, is not a limited place, but a spiritual life-sphere, whose rudiments and germs lie in the narrow corporeal life, as in a concentric inner circle. God's world cannot be *dualistically* split into a visible and invisible world; as little can it be separated by a *rationalistic* or *deistical* cross-cut into an upper and under world. He has created His world, the material world, to be glorified with a receptivity for eternal spiritual being, *finitum infiniti capax.*

2. *The Ethical Consequence* of the Christian view is: in the earthly life to begin the heavenly, in time to seek and to find eternity, faithful in the least, the perishing, to gain the greatest, the eternal. Aptly and elegantly says the Epistle to *Diognetus* (chap. v. 6 in Scholz: *Apostolic Fathers*, p. 170) of Christians; they inhabit—Being in heaven. Comp. the beautiful hymn of Richter: *es glänzet der Christen inwendiges Leben.*

3. *Only in and with Christ* can we be even here assured of and joyful in eternal life; the true life is Christ in us.

4. *The motive* to constancy and fidelity in such a life is the glimpse of future glory, not the slavish fear of perdition, but child-like confidence and joy in the glory of the heritage and the heritage of glory.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Do not indefinitely seek what is above in heaven, but think of this, that there Christ is in glory with the Father, resting in the assurance of victory, taking part in the rule of the world. As the leaves that cool thee with their shade, shining in the sunlight and gaily rustling and dancing on the stem, were only born in the spring, begotten the summer before, in the sleeping eye as in a cradle, so in the heat of life is hiddenly prepared thy life to be manifested above: so God creates thy life in the quiet depth of the heart through and with Christ.—Wouldst thou be one day in heaven, then must heaven be in thee here: first the kingdom of God is in thee, then thou in it.

STARKE:—*Ascendamus interim corde, ut olim sequamur et corpore* (Augustine).—Think not, that by earnest meditation on the kingdom of God, all duties of house and office must be laid aside. We can find a place for that, even when the body is outwardly busy. Indeed through spiritual care of the soul, external business is properly regulated, sanctified and blessed.

GERLACH:—As Christ has concealed Himself from the bodily eye, and now lives a higher, heavenly, divine life; so does the Christian united to Him through faith. But the life of Christ will not always be thus concealed.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—The old man and the new man: this is the great contrast in which Paul's entire proclamation of the gospel moved. The old man is both the man of sin and the man of the law; the new man is both the new creature in whom Christ lives, and he, who serves the righteousness, which comes through faith and avails before God.—The walk is manifest, the life is hid, we can conclude respecting the latter, only from what is manifested in the former.

PASSAVANT:—The world knows not, sees not, what a new being has arisen in the believer through the risen Christ. He feels the life of Jesus in his heart.—Highest stand the prophets, apostles, martyrs, who "overcame by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and loved not their lives unto the death" (Rev. xii. 11). But all the rest, who have fought unto death, in patience and long-suffering, in holy fidelity, who are made kings and priests, will be called conquerors by their Head.

HEUBNER:—The higher, heavenly sense of the Christian proceeds from Christ, the Risen One,—this is its origin, its power—thither it goes also to His heavenly glory as its goal. He who has found the higher, forgets the lower.—PALMER:—The life in God: 1) a life of profound concealment, yet to be made manifest; 2) a life in blessed rest, yet with daily unrest and labor; 3) a life in heaven, yet with an appropriate blessing for earth.

GESETZ UND ZEUGNISS [a German theological periodical.—R.]: Live with Christ in God! 1) We have to make this way clear to ourselves; 2) to acquaint ourselves with the nature and quality of this life; 3) to inquire respecting the end, to which it develops itself.—The sign of spiritual resurrection; 1) heavenly mind; 2) divine life; 3) blessed hope.—The exhortation of the Apostle: Seek the things which are above! 1) How the Apostle explains it; 2) what grounds he adduces for it.—Our past and present and future [*Unser Sonst und Jetzt und Einst.*] 1) our *past;* a seeking and minding what is on the earth; a life without Christ and without God, manifest in sin and shame. 2) Our *present;* a seeking and minding what is above, where Christ is; a life hid with Christ in God. 3) Our *future;* a possessing and enjoying all that after which we here strive in faith; a life with God manifested with Christ in glory.

[ANDREWES: Vers. 1, 2. Christ is risen, and if Christ then we. If we so be, then we "seek;" and that we cannot unless we "set our minds." On what? On "things above," not on earth, but where "Christ is." And why there? Because where He is, there are the things we seek for, and here cannot find. There He "is sitting" and so at rest. And at "the right hand" so in glory. "God's right hand" and so forever. These we seek, rest in eternal glory. These Christ hath found and so shall we, if we begin to "set our minds" to search after them.—LUTHER:—Ver. 2. We live not in the flesh, but we dwell in the flesh. BP. DAN. WILSON:—Things on earth too naturally draw us down, attract us,

fix us. Esau's red pottage prevails over the birthright. The guests in the parable turn away to their land, or oxen, or families. The Gadarene mind wishes Christ to depart from its coasts.—R.]

[EADIE:—The pilgrim is not to despise the comforts which he may meet with by the way, but he is not to tarry among them, or leave them with regret.—WORDSWORTH:—Be ye good trees. Now, in the world's eye, is your winter; to men ye appear like dry sticks. Your life is *hid* with Christ. Ye are dead in *appearance*, but not dead *in reality;* dead as to show of luxuriant leaves, but not dead in your spiritual root. Your root is Christ. His coming will be your summer. Then ye will put forth a glorious foliage. Ye will *appear* with Him in glory. And the leafy fig-tree of this world will be withered by His coming.—R.]

[BEVERIDGE: Sermon on ver. 2. 1) Why "not on things on the earth?" *a*) they are below you and unsuitable to you both as men and Christians; *b*) they can never satisfy your desires; *c*) are troublesome and disquieting; *d*) unimportant and unnecessary (can neither make you happy themselves, nor conduce thereto); *e*) fleeting and unconstant. 2) Why "on things above?" *a*) nothing was made or designed as a proper object for our affections but these; *b*) our relations "above:" *c*) our possessions. 3) What affections? *a*) our thoughts and meditations; *b*) our affection of love; *c*) our desires; *d*) our joy. Thus become holy and happy.—R.]

---

2. General exhortations.

CHAPTER III. 5–17.

a) Exhortation to put off the old fleshly nature.

(CHAP. III. 5–11.)

5 Mortify therefore your[1] members which are upon the earth: fornication, unclean-
ness, inordinate affection [lustfulness],[2] evil concupiscence [or shameful desire],[3] and
6 covetousness, which is idolatry: For which things'[4] sake the wrath of God cometh on the
7 children of disobedience:[5] In the which [Among whom][6] ye also walked sometime
8 [once], when ye lived [imperfect, were living] in them. But now ye also put off all
these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy [evil speaking],[7] filthy [abusive][8] communi-
9 cation out of your mouth. Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the
10 old man with his deeds; And have put on the new *man*, which is renewed [is being
renewed][9] in [unto, εἰς] knowledge [,] after the image of him that created him:
11 Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian,
Scythian, bond *nor* [omit *nor*][10] free: but Christ *is* all, and in all.

[1] Ver. 5.—Ὑμῶν is wanting in ℵ. A. B. and others. [It is omitted by Tischendorf (ed. 2, not 7), Alford, and by Braune; retained however by Rec. Lachmann, Meyer, De Wette, Wordsworth, Ellicott; the latter remarks: "The great preponderance of MSS. and the accordant testimony of so many versions seem to render this otherwise not improbable omission here very doubtful."—R.]

[2] Ver. 5.—[Alford and Ellicott thus render πάθος: not merely "lust," but the disposition toward it —R.]

[3] Ver. 5.—["Evil concupiscence" is correct, but "shameful desire" would be more generally understood.—R.]

[4] Ver. 6.—Δι' ἅ on the authority of ℵ. B. C. and others, is better supported than δι' ὅ. [The former reading is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Ellicott: the latter by Meyer and Alford.—R.]

[5] Ver. 6.—The clause ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας, "on the children of disobedience," is wanting in B.; apparently taken from Eph. v. 6, where it is supported by all. [Rejected by Tischendorf and Alford. The uncial authority, ℵ. A. C. D. E. K. L., in support of it is so preponderant, that it cannot safely be omitted. The two Epistles might well contain expressions exactly alike. Meyer retains it.—R.]

[6] Ver. 7.—[Ἐν οἷς refers to "the children of disobedience," if that clause be retained. If it be rejected, the E. V. is correct, but is incorrect as it now stands. (Braune, Ellicott.)—R.]

[7] Ver. 8.—["Evil-speaking" or "calumny" is evidently the meaning of βλασφημίαν here, as in Eph. iv. 31, where the E. V. reads: "evil-speaking."—R.]

[8] Ver. 8.—["Abusive," perhaps "foul-mouthed communication," is better than "filthy;" the idea of obscenity is not necessarily included in αἰσχρολογίαν.—R.]

[9] Ver. 10.—[The present participle here denotes a process going on. See EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[10] Ver. 11.—Before ἐλεύθερος. A. and others read καί, a few also before Σκύθης, but both weakly supported. ["Nor" is unnecessarily supplied in the E. V.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The first exhortation concerning the relation to the pleasures and possessions of earth. Vers. 5–7.

Ver. 5. **Mortify therefore your members, which are upon the earth.**—"Mortify therefore" is joined to vers. 1–4, containing an inference from "were raised together" (ver. 1) and "died" (ver. 3). Their being dead has as its result a new life, in which a "making dead" (νεκροῦν) is possible and necessary. The verb (only here and Rom. iv. 19; Heb. xi. 12) is *reddere νεκρόν, i. e., cadaver omnibus viribus privatum* (πτῶμα), stronger than θανατοῦν (Rom. viii. 13). See TITTMANN, *Syn.* I. p. 168. [The aorist

denotes a definite act, which ELLICOTT thus expresses: "kill at once;" ALFORD: "put to death."—R.] After the Christian died (ver. 3), he has as quickened (ver. 1), with the newly gained vital power, to kill the "members which are upon the earth." This expression corresponds with the context, and refers in its sense to "putting off the body of the flesh" (ii. 11). There the whole organism was brought into view, here the individual members; there "of the flesh" describes what here, in accordance with ver. 3, is described by "which are upon the earth" (BENGEL: where is found the sustenance of those members, of which collectively the body of sin consists). Because they are "fleshly," there is a motive for putting them to death. This must be understood in an *ethical*, not a *physical* sense (HUTHER, UNGER and others), not of the Church members as the vital activities of the body of the Church (SCHENKEL); for the Christian is not required to mutilate his body, nor are members or masses of members "who are on the earth," organs of the Church and its activity, since it is a creation of God; the words might be applied to Christians, who are worldly-minded, but, as regards these, *νεκροῦν*, putting to death, is a duty only in the view of fanatics.

[ELLICOTT thus aptly paraphrases: "As you died, and your true life is hidden with Christ, and hereafter to be developed in glory, act conformably to it—let nothing live inimical to such a state, kill at once the organs and media of a merely earthly life." Put to death the portions of your body, which are the instruments of sin, as respects the sphere (on the earth) of these sinful activities, and the actions and desires below specified: a duty very different from and more difficult than asceticism, or obedience to "the commandments of men" (ii. 21, 22).—R.]

The substantives, which follow in appositional relation to "members," show more specifically what is meant: **fornication, uncleanness, lustfulness, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry.**—BENGEL: "these (*μέλη*, members) are enumerated." There is no metonymy here (DE WETTE), nor are these the ethical ingredients inhering in the members (MEYER, WINER's *Gram.* p. 494). On the first two and the last substantives, see on Eph. v. 3. "Lustfulness" (*π ά θ ο ς*) [not limited to unnatural lust, as Rom. i. 26.—R.] and "evil concupiscence" (*ἐ π ι θ υ μ ί α κ α κ ή*) are to be referred, according to the context, to sexual sin; the former denoting rather the formal eagerness, the latter the intrinsic unworthiness, determined by the object; the former is always the latter also, but not *vice versa* (1 Thess. iv. 5: "in the lust of concupiscence," *ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας*). [The latter being more general.—R.] The category introduced by "fornication," on account of its manifold and frequent manifestations (Gal. v. 19), is prominently set forth in detail; unnatural uncleanness is included in the last two substantives, but not specially described (ERASMUS and others).

By the side of "fornication" thus specified, the Apostle puts "covetousness" as a second category, indicated by the article. Bengel: *articulus facit ad epitasin et totum genus vitii a genere enumeratarum modo specierum diversum complectitur.* He gives prominence to this by means of the relative clause, which characterizes it and gives a motive for mortifying it. "Which" (*quippe quæ*, "which indeed;" WINER's *Gram.* pp. 111, 157). See on Eph. v. 5. It is incorrect to apply it to insatiable voluptuousness (ESTIUS and others) or to "gains from lust" (BAEHR and others). [Braune in the parallel passage extends the application of the relative clause to all the preceding forms of sin, which application is grammatically inadmissible here, though allowable there. *Π λ ε ο ν ε ξ ί α*, "covetousness," is marked by the article as the notorious form of sin, not merely introduced thus as forming a new category; for while it is another form of sin, there is an intimate connection in point of fact, "monsters of covetousness have been also monsters of lust." Covetousness has as its primary object—wealth—but there is no objection to expanding its meaning here, as TRENCH does. He intimates that the Greek Fathers use this word to designate both the sins of impurity and avarice, "even as the root out of which they alike grow; namely, the fierce and ever fiercer longing of the creature which has turned from God, to fill itself with the inferior objects of sense is one and the same." *Syn. N. T.* § 24. This is idolatry. It is worthy of notice too that idolatry and lust are connected historically, as well as in the O. T. *passim.*—R.]

Ver. 6. **For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh.**—Thus he adds a motive for the necessity of the exhortation, "mortify:" you must either kill or be killed. The relative refers to the sins mentioned above,* on account of which "the wrath of God cometh." See on Eph. v. 6. [Also for notes upon: **on the children of disobedience**, which Braune rejects here.—R.] The absence of "on the children of disobedience" denotes a reference to God's judgment on earth, under which the saints also suffer. The expression, which is to be distinguished from "the day of wrath" (Rom. ii. 5), and the context which is to be distinguished from 1 Thess. i. 10, "the wrath to come," does not refer to the future judgment (MEYER, BLEEK and others). [ELLICOTT, following Theophilus, refers it to punishment here and hereafter. There is this strong objection to Braune's view, that the New Testament does not represent the wrath of God as coming in any sense upon the saints. If the longer reading be adopted, his remark is also grammatically incorrect. Whatever interpretation be put upon *ἐν οἷς*, the following verse excludes the Colossian Christians from the threatened wrath.—R.]

Ver. 7. **Among whom ye also once walked.**—If "on the children of disobedience" be retained, the relative must be joined to that antecedent; otherwise it refers as *δι' ἅ* to the enumerated sins. "Once walked" denotes their conduct in different relations. See on Eph. ii. 2.—**When ye were living in them.**—[That is, in these sins, as the sphere of life. There is no tautology if the personal reference of the last clause be adopted.—R.] The verb, in emphatic

* [ALFORD, reading δι' ὅ, refers it to "idolatry" alone, and hence in his exegesis, makes it "the all-comprehending and crowning sin." MEYER, adopting the same reading, refers it to the whole immoral character just named. —R.]

position, marks the internal life with undisturbed gratification, while "walk" denotes the manifestations of it in thought, word and deed; the imperfect ("were living") refers to a continued state, the aorist ("walked") to the individual acts, corresponding thus with the meaning of the verbs. Their sinful walk was conditioned by their sinful nature, not merely by habit and circumstance. BENGEL: *Vivebatis tanquam in vestro principio, origine, elemento* (Gal. v. 25). Hence ἐν τούτοις and ἐν οἷς refer to the same antecedent. This is not tautological (MEYER) but emphatic: the first is not merely walking in heathenism, and the other a vicious life (SCHENKEL); the former is rather the "act" and the latter the "power" of sin (CALVIN) or the one "energy," ἐνεργεία, the other "habit of nature" (ESTIUS).—[It is obvious how much is gained in the exegesis of this verse, by retaining "on the children of disobedience." It then means: "Among which children of disobedience ye also walked, when ye were living in these sins." Surely with preponderant uncial authority, this exegetical advantage should decide in favor of retaining it, instead of being used to support the omission as *lectio difficilior*.—R.]

The second exhortation concerning their social relations to each other. Ver. 8–11.

Ver. 8. **But now ye also put off all these.**—"But now" (νυνὶ δέ), in contrast with "once," (ποτέ, ὅτε), is the present Christian state, which begins with conversion. Hence "put off" corresponds with "mortify" (ver. 5), or "put away from you" (Eph. iv. 31), and "ye also" puts the readers here beside other Christians, as in ver. 7 by other heathen. "All these" (τὰ πάντα) refers to what follows (WINER'S *Gram.* p. 102); not to all those (ver. 5) and these also which follow (MEYER, SCHENKEL). [ELLICOTT, ALFORD follow MEYER, but Braune's view is more strictly grammatical. EADIE unfortunately makes the verb indicative instead of imperative.—R.]—**Anger, wrath, malice, evil-speaking, abusive communication out of your mouth.**—See on Eph. iv. 31. The last substantive is wanting there, but corresponds to αἰσχρότης καὶ μωρολογία (Eph. v. 4). It describes shameful speech in general, which, according to the context injures the neighbor, who hears it or of whom it is spoken, as "evil speaking" (βλασφημία). It is not to be applied to lewd speaking (LUTHER and others), at least not exclusively, though it may include it. The first three substantives form a climax, describing the internal condition, from perceptible excitement to passionateness which is its basis, then to deep-seated malicious nature; the other two refer to speech, hence to both is significantly added: "out of your mouth." It might be joined with "put off," but without any reference to the first three, since it would not be enough that among Christians these never found expression in words (SCHENKEL); they should not be found at all.

Ver. 9. **Lie not one to another.**—See Eph. iv. 25. Εἰς denotes the direction: belie not one another. [The practice is thus stamped as a social wrong (ELLICOTT). MICHAELIS observes that it is only in this Epistle and that to the Ephesians, that the Apostle warns his readers against *lying* (BARNES).—R.] The aorist participles which follow (vers. 9 b–11) give a motive for the injunction in vers. 8, 9 a.—**Seeing that ye have put off the old man.**—[The E. V. thus admirably expresses the force of the aorist participle ἀπεκδυσάμενοι.—R.] The aorist requires this as the Apostle's view: first, the experienced death and rising, then the active mortification of the members, first the experienced putting off the old man and putting on the new, then the active removal of what is contrary thereto, here a motive, drawn from what has preceded, is pre-supposed. Hence the Vulgate: *exspoliantes*, and BENGEL: "putting off," as if it were contemporaneous, are incorrect; LUTHER also: put off, as though it were an injunction. The verb is to be taken according to the parallel expression (Eph. iv. 22: ἀπόθεσθε) like the substantive ii. 11, and its object as in Eph. iv. 22. The old man, the sinful nature as it is before conversion and regeneration is to be laid off as a garment that has become useless, with all its peculiarities, hence: **with his deeds.**—Here is the stringent conclusion that what was detailed above must of course be put away. Comp. Rom. viii. 13; Gal. v. 24: "the flesh with the affections (παθήμασιν) and lusts."

Ver. 10. **And have put on the new man.**—The putting off and on, connected by καί, are to be regarded as contemporaneous, according to the principle: *natura et gratia non patiuntur vacuum* (nature and grace do not tolerate a vacuum); only in the domain of grace in distinction from the physical, the initiative is with the new man and in virtue of the divine power creating him. In contrast with παλαιός, old, we have in Eph. iv. 24, καινός, new, as not yet present, here νέος; παλαιός being therefore old, superannuated, senile; both are found in Eph. iv. 23, 24 (ἀνανεοῦσθαι—καινόν) and here in the adjective and added participle. The motive drawn from νέον, recent, young, as it were [newly entered and fresh state. ELLICOTT.—R.], lies in the danger prepared by the false teachers for Christians, who had been just now or not long converted.

The condition of the new man and his immediate task is more closely defined: **which is being renewed,** τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον.—The present participle denotes what is to go on in the present. The context requires the middle sense to denote the self-exertion, the active life. The new man is not anything complete at once, but in a state of vital growth, of further development, and that by the Holy Spirit (Tit. iii. 5). [This seems to contradict the last opinion that the participle is middle. ALFORD, ELLICOTT, WORDSWORTH all regard it as passive. The latter naturally suggests: "the new man was born in you at your *regeneration* in baptism, but needs the *daily renewal* of the Holy Ghost." Omit "in baptism," and the explanation will be generally received as correct. The passive or middle interpretation will be adopted as the stress is laid upon the divine or human side of the progressive work of sanctification, and yet as the Apostle is speaking of the new man, of our *becoming* holy, which lies back of active holiness, the passive is to be preferred. The new man is being renewed, rather than renewing himself.—R.] Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 16. The preposition ἀνά marks the

further, upward, onward striving, which is then more closely defined:

Unto knowledge, after the image of him that created him.—"Unto knowledge" denotes the *end*, "after the image of Him that created him," the *norm.* According to ii. 2; i. 9, "knowledge" is not further characterized as a knowledge corresponding to the image of the Creator, for by thus regarding both clauses as one (HOFFMANN, MEYER), no natural sense is given. In this knowledge, which cannot be supplied by worldly wisdom, the new man must grow according to the image of his Creator, God; this image is Christ, since the Christian is a "new creature" (2 Cor. v. 17). There is an unmistakable allusion and reference to the first creation" (Gen. i. 26, 27). The second new creation is not to be separated from the first, the Christian is the genuine man, Christianity is true, God-willed humanity. [The latter clause is to be joined with "being renewed" (ALFORD, ELLICOTT). The final word "him" refers to the "new man." The passage means more than the restoration of the image of God lost by Adam. "It is certain that the image of God, in which Christ's Spirit re-creates us, will be as much more glorious than that, as the second man is more glorious than the first" (ALFORD). So EADIE *in loco.* Compare Eph. iv. 24.—R.]

Ver. 11. **Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond, free.**—"Where" refers to the region of the new creation in Christ, in contrast with the domain of creation without Christ; in the latter there is division, contrariety and discord; in the former union, fraternity. Just as in the parallel passage (Eph. iv. 25: "for we are members one of another"), this fellowship of the regenerate, the converted, requires truth and friendship among each other. It is incorrect to join "where," as =*qua in se*, to the yet remote "knowledge" alone, finding here its object now brought in (SCHENKEL). Ἔνι means, as in Homer: there is there, therein; οὐκ ἔνι denies division as respects nationality ("Greek and Jew"),* as respects religion ("circumcision and uncircumcision"), culture ("Barbarian, Scythian"), social status ("bond, free"). It is worthy of note, that, in nationality, the Greek who ruled in language is put before the Roman who held empire; in religion, Israel honored with revelation takes precedence; in culture, the step is from the uncultivated to the extreme savage (BENGEL: "Scythians, more barbarous than the Barbarians;" βαρβαρώτατοι), as in Rom. i. 14, the polished Greek not being again mentioned, while the summary is indicated by the omission of the conjunction; in the social category, the slave stands before the freeman to note the receptivity of the insignificant, and the exalting power of the gospel. Comp. Gal. iii. 28. [LANGE'S *Com.* pp. 88, 91.—R.]

But Christ is all and in all.—"But" presents the contrast to the condition in the region of the natural life; hence within the Church there is not difference, divisions; in spite of the distinctions, there is no schism there, but union, concord on the ground of unity; in all these four directions (τὰ πάντα), and in all the individual persons, the Christians ("in all," καὶ ἐν πᾶσι) is the same (Χριστός), "who alone occupies the whole, as the saying is, between stem and stern, and is both beginning and end" (CALVIN). Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 28; Gal. vi. 15. BENGEL: "Scythian is not Scythian, but Christ's; Barbarian is not Barbarian, but Christ's. Christ is all things, and that in all who believe. In Christ are new creatures." [MEYER: "The subject is placed at the end, for the greatest emphasis. *He*, the all determining principle of the new life and activity (τὰ πάντα) in all his believers (ἐν πᾶσι), forms the higher unity, in which all those old divisions and antitheses become without significance and as if no longer existing." ELLICOTT: "Christ is the aggregation of all things, distinctions, prerogatives, blessings, and moreover is in all, dwelling in all, and so uniting all in the common element of Himself."—R.]

* [The E. V. places the negation in the conjunctions. A more literal rendering would be: "There is not Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision," *etc.*—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Christian Exhortation.* All truly Christian exhortation to a moral life, internal and external alike, is directed mainly towards the right use of salvation as already possessed, towards its preservation in given circumstances, and the maintenance of conduct which meets the conditions of the rightly adjusted relations of the Christian. What is accepted and received as a germ through faith in the mercy of God in Christ, must be held fast, ever more vitally appropriated, nourished and developed practically in every direction. The regenerated believer, with the powers imparted to him by God, must now so work, that his action and conduct are as much his consenting, as God's continued action. Christ *for* us becomes Christ *in* us, and Christ *before* us becomes Christ *through* us.

2. *The world in and about the Christian.* With respect to its pleasure, sensual, especially sexual pleasure, he must strive after purity; with respect to its possessions, after contentment, in order not to fall away from God and under His wrath. [For the sin of sensuality is not only intimately connected with that of covetousness, but both are essentially idolatrous. Those "without God" (Eph. ii. 12) are "in the world," and the world's pleasures and possessions are put by them in the place of God.—R.]

3. *Towards his neighbor*, especially the brethren, there must be friendliness in disposition, word and truth.

4. *All sin must be repelled.* All that is opposed to what is required, both in its various shades from coarser to finer and finest, and in its different manifestations in act, word, thought, perception, from external to internal and inmost, must be contended against and repelled. *Only* what is sinful, yet *all* that is sinful, is contrary to Christianity and Christian character.

5. *Christ the point of unity.* Upon the absolute dignity of Christ and His central position toward the world (i. 17: "in Him all things subsist"), which points to His Divine Fulness (i. 19; ii. 9), to Him as the image of the Creator, rests the fact that He is the absolute point of unity, the central

and terminal point for men. What He is for the macrocosm He is also for the microcosm; He is the Second Adam, "a quickening spirit" (1 Cor. xv. 45). Hence the requirement to become a Christian and be a Christian must be deemed absolute for every man. Union with Christ is absolutely right, but it alone; contrasted with it all diversities as to nationality, confession, culture and station (ver. 11) are only relatively right; this they are, in so far as that absolute right remains unimpaired. Cosmopolitism in political and social life, union in denominational life are fruitless, or stunted products of the natural man working within the Church, when and where they do not recognize and maintain union with Christ, established above all unions. This is then the rule: one with Christ, united with one another. By this every Christian, that is every evangelical Christian, and every age, such as that of the Reformation, must be tested. [By it too must be tested many human organizations, which aim at uniting selfish men so as to contribute to the common good. Many social and political problems remain to be solved, but social science has not always remembered that "the putting on of the new man" alone brings man "where there is neither Greek nor Jew—bond nor free, but Christ all and in all."—R.] Compare the notes on Eph. iv. 22 sq.; v. 25; v. 5, 6.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

With every sin look at its concealed beginning in the heart, and its public issue in the judgment of God, who regards the heart.—Be not content with strength enough to prevent the sin of the heart from breaking out unto word and work. Be so ashamed of the past, that the present may not be as it was, and the future become far worse.—As a rule lying *to* others is closely connected with lying *about* others.

STARKE:—Improvement of the sinful life is as difficult for the flesh, as if the man should go to his death; for he is as much in love with fleshly lusts, as if this were his life. One of the chiefest members of the old man is "the lust of the flesh;" this secret poison hides in all. Though this fire be at once quenched in believers, yet, if they do not take care, the ever-glowing cinders may easily and quickly burst into a flame again. 2 Sam. xi. 2 sq.—Covetousness breaks not only the eighth and tenth commandments of the second table, but the first and second of the other also; hence the covetous are idolaters too.—Old rags we throw away; sin, which makes us so old and deformed and ugly before God, the Christian must so put away, that he not only restrains its outbreak, but also exhausts the spring itself, draining it more and more, even if he does not dry it up entirely.—[What a mark of our great corruption, that the tongue, which should be the means of doing our neighbor good, is so often the instrument to injure him.—R.]—The state of the regenerate is a putting off the old and a putting on the new man. Hence in a believer there are as it were, two men or a double nature, Spirit and flesh, which contend against each other. Gal. v. 17. The one from its corrupt propensity wills what is evil, the other from divine operation what is good.

RIEGER:—With *all* that belongs to the old nature, we are never done; yet we should not be grieved by the way: the quietest plan is with childlike mind to learn, and to regard the matter as ever in progress.—GERLACH:—The capacity for knowing and loving God is that alone wherein man excels the rest of creation, whereby he rules it. Is he a mirror of the Most High, then there is in him an image of God, which sin has not obliterated, but so polluted and marred that his own power can never more restore it.—When the image of God is restored in the soul, the partition-walls among men fall down.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—When Christians seem to us to be not yet permeated entirely by the new life in Christ, we may not thence infer an entire lack of the Spirit.—Paul admonishes them to put off their old members, not by virtue of the old man itself, but by virtue of the new and because the vital strength of the new man in them is presupposed.—This work of putting off the old man and putting on the new is a common one, and we should not believe in the fancy that somewhere it is wanting altogether.

PASSAVANT:—[Ver. 15. Covetousness which is idolatry can be found among Christians, in men who rejoice in a Christian education, and bow before the cross of Christ as the tree of life. The life of the covetous man is hid with his hoards in iron chests; the life of the Christian is "hid with Christ in God."—Ver. 7. It is better, if one has never walked in these things, if they have never been the elements of our life, for then our sanctification is easier. On this account we should learn the fear of God from our youth.]—Ver. 8. A single word, slipping from the mouth of the Christian can pollute the whole God-sanctified new man.—[Ver. 9. It is long before a tongue, hitherto unaccustomed to lie, becomes accustomed to the truth; this is the work of the Spirit of God, which is the Spirit of truth.—Ver. 11. God regards in us only His Son and His image, as He hates only the old man and his corruption.—R.]

[BURKITT:—Ver. 7. No argument will prevail more with a Christian to follow on the work of mortification closely for the time to come, than the remembrance of his long continuance in sin in time past.—Ver. 9. Lying makes a man like the devil, who was a liar as well as a murderer from the beginning.—Ver. 11. O blessed Jesus! Art thou thus all to me? I will labor to be all to thee; to give thee all that I am.—R.]

[HENRY:—Ver. 5. It is very observable, that among all the other instances of sin which good men are recorded in the Scripture to have fallen into; (and there is scarcely any but some or other in one or other part of their life, have fallen into;) there is no instance in all the Scripture of any good man charged with covetousness.—Ver. 9. Lying makes us like the devil (who is the father of lies), and is a prime part of the devil's image upon our souls.—Ver. 10. The new man is said to be renewed in knowledge; because an ignorant soul cannot be a good soul. Light is the first thing in the new creation, as it was in the first.—R.]

[EADIE:—Ver. 5. If the heart is dead let all the organs which it once vivified and moved die too—nay, put them to death. Let them be

killed from want of nutriment and exercise.—This desire of having more, and yet more, is idolatry. What it craves it worships, what it worships it makes its portion.—Ver. 11. 1. Such distinctions do not prevent the on-putting of the new man. 2. In the church, prior and external distinctions do not modify the possession of spiritual privilege and blessing.—WORDSWORTH: —Ver. 5. You must be dead to earth, in order to life in heaven. While we mortify our members upon the earth, we quicken our members in heaven.—R.]

---

b) Exhortation to Christian love one toward another, and to glorifying the name of Christ in word and work.

CHAPTER III. 12–17.

12 Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy [or saints][1] and beloved, bowels of
13 mercies [mercy], kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering: Forbear-
ing one another, and forgiving one another [each other],[2] if any man have a quarrel
[or complaint, μομφήν] against any: even as Christ[3] forgave you, so also *do* ye [*doing*
14 yourselves].[4] And above [But over][5] all these things *put on* charity [love],
15 which[6] is the bond of perfectness. And let the peace of God [Christ][7] rule in your
hearts, to the which also ye are [were] called in one body; and be ye thankful.
16 Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly [;] in all wisdom; [omit semi-colon]
teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and [omit and][8] hymns [*and*]
spiritual songs, singing with grace [in grace[9] singing] in your hearts to the Lord
17 [God].[10] And [everything] whatsoever ye do in word or deed, *do* all in the name
of the Lord Jesus,[11] giving thanks to God and the Father [God the Father][12] by
him.

[1] Ver. 12.—[Ἅγιοι, "saints," if used substantively as Braune holds. See EXEG. NOTES. There are several quite unimportant various readings in this verse; οἰκτιρμοῦ and πραΰτητα are preferable to οἰκτιρμῶν and πραότητα of the Rec.—R.]

[2] Ver. 13.—[Ἀλλήλων—ἑαυτοῖς; there is nothing in the E. V. to indicate that different words follow the two participles.—R.]

[3] Ver. 13.—Instead of ὁ Χριστός, C. [K. L., most versions, Tischendorf, Meyer. Ellicott, Wordsworth, Rec.], A. B. and others [Lachmann, Alford] read ὁ κυρίος. ℵ. ὁ θεός. Besides, θεὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *deus in christo*, occur.

[4] Ver. 13.—[To supply an imperative, with E. V., breaks the construction unnecessarily. If anything be supplied in English it should be the auxiliary participle as above.—R.]

[5] Ver. 14.—[Ἐπὶ πᾶσιν δὲ τούτοις. "But over all these;"—"above all" is ambiguous.—R.]

[6] Ver. 14.—A. B. C. F. G. and others read ὅ; ὅς in ℵ. is a correction, as well as the later ἥτις; [Rec., grammatical emendation (Meyer, Alford).—R.]

[7] Ver. 15.—[Τοῦ Χριστοῦ on the authority of ℵ. A. B. C. and most versions, modern editors generally, instead of τοῦ θεοῦ, Rec., followed by E. V.—R.]

[8] Ver. 16.—Καί before ὕμνοις and ᾠδαῖς added from Eph. v. 19.

[9] Ver. 16.—[Braune omits the article before χάριτι and renders "in thanksgiving." But it is retained by most modern editors on the authority of B. and others. See EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[10] Ver. 16.—[Τῷ θεῷ is the reading of the mass of MSS., adopted by most modern editors; κυριῷ, Rec. Lachmann, probably taken from Eph. v. 19.—R.]

[11] Ver. 17.—B reads κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ℵ. inserts Χριστοῦ, others omit κυρίου. [Lachmann, Ellicott, Wordsworth follow the last reading; Tischendorf, Alford, Rec. that of B.—R].

[12] Ver. 17.—[Καί, probably from Eph. v. 20, is omitted in ℵ. A. B. C., by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The virtues of the new man in intercourse with the brethren (vers. 12–14).

Ver. 12. **Put on therefore.**—To the "have put on the new man" (ver. 10) there is joined, as a consequence ("therefore"), the positive precept, which finds a motive, as a continuing and valid requirement, in the "being renewed;" although they have put on the new man, they have yet to take up anew the single parts. [ELLICOTT, following HOFFMANN, thinks οὖν has here more of its reflexive force, taking up what has been said and continuing it: "as you have put on the new man, put on all its characteristic qualities." But even this paraphrase implies a "moral consequence." "For although the putting on of the new man as a fact. *has* historically occurred through the conversion to Christ, yet it has, according to the nature of the new man, its continued acts, which *should* occur, viz., through the appropriation of those virtues, which the new man as such must possess" (MEYER).—R.]

As the elect of God, [holy or] saints and beloved, conditions the justice of the precept and the indispensableness of complying with it. "As" gives prominence to the actual

condition, relation, in which they stand.—"Elect of God" is used substantively as Matt. xxiv. 31; Mark xiii. 27; Luke xviii. 7; Rom. viii. 33; Tit. i. 1: "saints" (ἅγιοι) as Rom. i. 7; xv. 25, 26, 31; xvi. 2, 15; 1 Cor. i. 2, etc. Ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (Mark i. 24; Luke iv. 34; Jno. vi. 69) is a description of the Christian; ἅγιοι αὐτοῦ ("His saints") also occurs (2 Thess. i. 10). The position of the genitive (τοῦ θεοῦ) however requires it to be joined with the first term ("elect"). "Beloved" is also used substantively as Eph. i. 6. The climax here is unmistakable: as to the ground, they are without desert "elect of God," as to their condition they are "saints," as to their relation to God, they are, as the perfect denotes, the continued objects of His love (1 Thess. i. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 13). BENGEL: "the order of words corresponds exquisitely with the order of things: eternal *election* precedes sanctification in time, the sanctified feel love, and then imitate it." The last, firmly founded on the preceding, has the stress laid on it. All three are correlatives of "putting on the new man," which pre-supposes the "election of God" (vers. 10, 11). Hence neither are the last two substantives and the first an adjective (BLEEK), nor the first subject and the two others predicates (MEYER, BENGEL). [So also EADIE, ALFORD and ELLICOTT. Either view is admissible on grammatical grounds. ELLICOTT urges that the force of the exhortation rests on their character as "elect," while ALFORD insists that as ἐκλεκτοί is a word, which must find its ground independently of us in the absolute will of God, it cannot be an adjunctive attribute of the other two. On the whole the view of MEYER, followed by the commentators just mentioned, and implied in the E. V., is preferable. For it seems better accordant with Paul's method of stating the truth of Divine grace, and with the position of the words to lay the emphasis upon the phrase "elect of God," and not to regard the three phrases as co-ordinate. "The consciousness of this extraordinary privilege, of being the elect of God, who as such are holy and beloved of God—how it must have affected the conscience of the readers and aroused them to the very virtues, corresponding with so high a position, which Paul here enjoins!" MEYER.—R.]

Bowels of mercy, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering.—"Bowels of mercy" stands foremost; *viscera* with the quality of mercy, of which they are the seat. Phil. ii. 1, we find "bowels and mercies." The first word denotes what is inmost, most individual (Phil. i. 8; Philem. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 12: 1 Jno. iii. 17). Luke i. 78, "tender mercy of God" lit., "bowels of mercy of God" is similar. So Eph. iv. 32, "tender-hearted," "heart of mercy" (εὐσπλαγχνοι). The manifestations of mercy then follow, forming a climax; "kindness" which as the opposite of "severity" (Rom. xi. 22) helps outward need, "humbleness of mind" (ταπεινοφροσύνην) which recognizes our own unworthiness and the superiority or talent of a brother, "meekness," which as the opposite of "fierceness" (ἀγριότης), is mild toward faults which are blameworthy, and "long-suffering" which restrains itself so as to quietly bear reprehensible injuries in the hope of a better mind and consequent improvement on the part of the offender. See on Eph. iv. 2, 32. TITTMANN, *Synon.* I. 140–142. [Comp. TRENCH; *Syn.* New Testament, *sub vocibus.* He makes "meekness" to be at first in respect to God, then toward men as growing out of this. But in this case it is primarily toward man, though implying the other as its ground (ALFORD, ELLICOTT, while EADIE excludes the reference to God).—R.]

Ver. 13. **Forbearing one another and forgiving each other.**—These participles define the modality of the exhibition of the virtues just mentioned; they must be appropriated by practice which makes the master. The present tense indicates permanence. On "forbearing," see Eph. iv. 2, on "forgiving," Eph. iv. 32. "One another" (ἀλλήλων) marks the purely reciprocal, mutual enduring, forbearing; "each other" (ἑαυτοῖς) indicates at the same time also, that they have experienced such forgiveness from without, from Him who is their Example. That which is difficult to bear and forgive in others, is not simply what one does against us, but also what he does in general, what is displeasing, unpleasant, or offensive in his manner, whatever in his relations to us may give occasion for blame (μομφήν), so that the participles refer to all the preceding virtues, not to the last one only. BENGEL arbitrarily distinguishes: forbearing in present offences, forgiving past offences.

If any man have a complaint against any.—[Μομφή, only here in N. T., but classical: "ground of blame," "just cause of complaint." —R.] TITTMANN, *Syn.* I. 29, distinguishes ἀμεμπτος and ἀμωμος—each is free from blame, the former because it is perfect and absolute in its members, the latter because it is free from vice; in the former nothing more can be desired, in the latter there is nothing to be reprehended. On this account, as well as because πρός, not κατά, is here used, a more general relation than that of hostility is indicated; this must be regarded as referring in general to an experience occurring every where, yet mildly described hypothetically, that one can easily find something to blame in another, as is indicated above. [The Greek conditional protasis here used always implies that the hypothesis is correct.—R.]

Even as Christ forgave you, so also doing yourselves.—Χαριζόμενοι is to be supplied in thought (WINER's *Gram.* p. 526). Hence there is no parenthesis here, nor a disrupted sentence, as though an imperative were to be supplied. [The E. V. gives the imperative, which is objectionable: ELLICOTT preserves the construction by rendering as above—R.] This expression is explained, ii. 13; Eph. iv. 32. Here we have "Christ," in Eph. i. 1: "God in Christ;" this variation will explain ii. 13. BENGEL is excellent: *Christus, cui maxima fuerat nobiscum querendi causa.* Accordingly "the grace (χάρις) of the Lord Jesus Christ" is often spoken of. "As" denotes the mode of forgiveness, as Luke vii. 37–47; xxiii. 34, not the accomplishment of reconciliation with God by His death.

Ver. 14. **But over all these things put on love.**—"Love," as in i. 4, 8; Eph. iv. 2, is to be taken as "brotherly love," which must come

over all those virtues, upon them (*ἐνδύσασθε*, ver. 12). [So E. V. supplies "put on," though "above" may or may not have the local or semi-local (ELLICOTT) force, which *ἐπί* here conveys. EADIE renders "in addition to," weakening the force of the passage. WORDSWORTH quotes Clement, who apparently refers "love" to "love to God."—R.] In reference to this "love," the Apostle adds: **which is the bond of perfectness.**—By the neuter [*ὅ*, not *ἥτις*—R.] the putting on of love as an act, is denoted. [The article is wanting—hence Braune renders "a bond." ELLICOTT says the omission may be due to the verb substantive.—R.] *Σύνδεσμος*, the encircling band, reminds us of a girdle, put over the clothes to hold them together. The genitive therefore adds those virtues included under the category of "perfectness," as Acts viii. 23: "the bond of iniquity;" Eph. iv. 3: "bond of peace." It is parallel with "in love" (Eph. iv. 2). Comp. Rom. xiii. 10: "love is the fulfilling of the law." The Pythagoreans called friendship "the bond of all the virtues." Hence *ὅ* is not to be rejected and *ἥτις* substituted (BLEEK), nor *ἀγάπη* to be regarded as neuter (MEYER); ii. 19 is not a parallel case, since there the masculine is used, and the construction is according to the sense, as Christ is conceived of under *κεφαλή*. Nor is love to be regarded as the upper garment (MEYER), nor "bond" as "sum total" (*Insbegriff*, OLSHAUSEN), nor as the efficient cause of "perfectness" (SCHENKEL); nor yet is the genitive to be taken attributively as that of quality (GROTIUS). [To refer "which" to the putting on of love is a doubtful interpretation. It does not agree so well with the figurative representation of the Apostle, who has already been speaking (ver. 12) of what they were to put on, and seems to be mentioning here the last garment required to complete the attire. To make the act of putting on the "bond of perfectness" would be an unnecessary obscuring of the metaphor; especially as we may readily take *ἀγάπη* absolutely. There is the same objection perhaps to MEYER's view, that love is here represented as an upper garment, but a close-fitting upper garment might well be, at the same time, the bond which enclosed and held together all the others. Adopting this view, we may not only say, that love itself is "that bond which unites all the graces into completeness and symmetry" (EADIE), but "without love there is no perfectness; this has its *conditio sine qua non* in the including of all its other parts in love" (MEYER). Love is the principal of all the other virtues, but is here named last, as if supplementary, because of the figure. Braune's view of the genitive, which is that of MEYER, is to be preferred to that of ELLICOTT, who regards it as a genitive of the subject: "love is the bond which belongs to, is the distinctive feature of perfection." ALFORD well remarks: "Those who find here justification by works, must be very hard put to discover support for that doctrine."—R.]

The frame of mind in which Christian love is to be exercised. Ver. 15. **And let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts.**—This is not a command, but only a wish, the fulfilment of which is of importance. The subject, which in Phil. iv. 7 is "the peace of God," is that peace wrought by God through Christ in the Holy Ghost, which, according to Jno. xiv. 27 ("my peace I give unto you"), can be accurately termed "of Christ." (See WINER's *Gram.* p. 175.) It is the calm of the soul resting on the consciousness of having a reconciled God and Father, in Christ the Saviour.—[ELLICOTT says, the idea in Phil. iv. 7 "is substantially the same, except that perhaps peace is there contemplated as in its antithesis to anxious worldliness, while here it is rather to the hard, unloving and unquiet spirit that mars the union of the one body." It must not be limited to, though it certainly includes, mutual concord.—R.]—The verb *βραβεύω*, "to be an umpire," and as such to award the prize as well as regulate the contest, marks the administrative activity in distinction from the legislative found in *βασιλεύειν*. [The idea of presiding, ordering, ruling, is to be retained; the reference to bestowing (WORDSWORTH), or even winning a prize, which some commentators find here, is forbidden by the phrase which follows.—R.]—The phrase "in your hearts," *ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν*, is not="in you," *ἐν ὑμῖν* (ver. 16); it refers to the inner, most individual relations, where the peace of Christ is to rule; it is not therefore to be referred to the unity of believers among themselves (Greek Fathers, CALVIN, GROTIUS, MEYER).

To the which also ye were called in one body.—["To the which," almost=for into it (ELLICOTT).—R.] This peace is the immediate end of the calling; this calling is marked by "also" (*καί*), which joins it to "rule," as that to which the rule of peace has to correspond. The result of the consummation of the calling on the part of God, and of its acceptance on the part of men, is described by "in one body" This refers to the Church as the body of Christ (Eph. iv. 4; ii. 16); which is the sphere and place, in which this calling is consummated and the called are to move. Therefore it is not=*εἰς ἓν σῶμα* (GROTIUS), nor is the Church as an organism the object of the Divine calling (SCHENKEL), which is addressed to individual persons. The calling in itself and the implanting in the Church constitute a benefit, important on account of the peace joined with it, and obligating to friendliness toward the brother, who has become partaker of the same; hence Paul adds: **and be ye thankful** [*sc.* to God.—R.]—Comp. ii. 7; iv. 2; Eph. v. 4. Knowledge of the benefit of the calling and the peace, together with gratitude therefor, must increase. The adjective (*εὐχάριστοι*) does not occur elsewhere in N. T. Incorrectly rendered "amiable," "friendly," by JEROME, ERASMUS, BAEHR, [CALVIN].

Helps to the exercise of Christian love. Vers. 16, 17.

Ver. 16. **Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly.**—"The word of Christ" is the word which He has spoken and caused to be proclaimed (1 Thess. i. 8; iv. 15; 2 Thess. iii. 1), and which communicates the inward peace, directing and leading to right conduct toward the brethren: "the word through which ye were called" (BENGEL); elsewhere called "the word of God" (i. 25; 1 Cor. xiv. 36; 2 Cor. ii. 17; iv. 2) from its highest cause, "of truth" (Eph. i. 5, 13) from its purport, "of life" (Phil. ii. 16) from its ef-

fect. But it must have a permanent locality, "as in a temple" (BENGEL): let it dwell "among you," as the context demands. It is not="in your hearts" (ver. 15) "in you" (THEODORET, BEZA and others). [EADIE: "within you;" MEYER, ALFORD: in you as a church, which seems to be Braune's view. Preferable on the whole, and suggestive of the truth, that want of general diffusion of the word of Christ among the people "richly," much prevents their obeying the following precept.—R.] "Richly" relates to substance, hence, not used in a stunted, abbreviated eclectic fashion. ["Not with a scanty foothold, but with a large and liberal occupancy" (EADIE).—R.] It does not refer to frequency of use, or to the members of the Church=among many (SCHENKEL).

In all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs.—["In all wisdom" is joined with what follows. The construction is thus rendered more harmonious; the preceding clause has its emphatic adverb last, and the two qualifying participial clauses each begin with an adverbial phrase of manner. EADIE, following the pointing of TISCHENDORF, joins "psalms," *etc.*, with the second clause, but this destroys the correspondence, while the objection he urges, in regard to psalms and hymns as the material of instruction, is not in keeping with his own quotation from Basil's encomium on the Psalms.—R.] The participles, which are to be joined with "you" in the nominative, just as in Eph. iv. 1-3 (WINER'S *Gram.* p. 532), refer to the application and use of the word present among them, describe the manner in which the word dwells among them. This explains "speaking to yourselves" (Eph. v. 19). The first verb indicates the intellectual, the other the moral reference. To both belong the definition of manner "in all wisdom" (comp. i. 28), which is placed first emphatically, and the asyndetic datives which define the means to be used [or "the vehicle in which" the teaching and admonishing was communicated (MEYER). —R.]. These means act the more instructively and effectively, the more familiar one is with them, for the hymn grows out of the word of God and of Christ, and these grow into such songs, as the Bible, the Psalter and Church history attest. TERTULLIAN: *Post aquam mannalem et lumina, ut quisque de scripturis sacris vel proprio ingenio potest, provocatur in medium canere.* Comp. Eph. v. 19. The reference is to public worship, to the use of the word of Christ and singing at the *agapæ* and in the family circle; it should not be limited to the latter (MEYER).

In grace singing in your hearts to God. —[Braune adopts the reading ἐν χάριτι, and therefore renders "in gratitude" (*Dankbarkeit*), but with LACHMANN, TISCHENDORF, MEYER, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, WORDSWORTH, it is better to retain the well supported article: τῇ χάριτι then refers to Divine grace, the element to which the singing was to be circumscribed,—that which should accompany it.—R.] The clause corresponds in its structure with the foregoing; "in all wisdom,"—"in grace," the participles, then the closer definition; they are coördinate therefore. It is altogether improper to join both with "be ye thankful," making "let the word . . . richly" parenthetical, or to connect "in psalms," *etc.*, with this clause (SCHENKEL), on the ground that singing instruction is inconceivable, or to join ἐν χάριτι with πνευματικαῖς (LUTHER: spiritual, lovely songs). Since "singing" on account of "in your hearts" (see ver. 15) must be referred to something internal, and "to God" indicates its direction, "in grace" must be a closer definition of the singing; "in gratitude," as 1 Cor. x. 30. The meaning of χάρις is like *gratia*. It cannot mean "in gracefulness" (iv. 6; Eph. iv. 29; ERASMUS, SCHENKEL), nor in grace, nor with the article: in the grace impelling thereto (CHRYSOSTOM, MEYER). [If the article be retained, this is undoubtedly the meaning; not only because *usus loquendi* favors such a view, but because the other meaning: "thankfully" would be a flat and unmeaning anticipation of "giving thanks" below (ALFORD).—R.] The opinion that the phrase "in your hearts" refers to the existing abuse of singing with the mouth (THEOPHYLACT) is not justified, since the reading is not τῇ καρδίᾳ, and the tone which accompanied instruction is here noted. [Yet the former clause seems to refer to singing with the mouth, and this to that "in the silence of the heart" (MEYER).— R.]

Ver. 17. **And everything whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus.**—It is evident that "do" must be supplied with "all" (πάντα), and that "all in the name of the Lord Jesus" corresponds with "everything whatsoever" [πᾶν ὅ τι—the absolute nominative.—R.]; "everything whatsoever" referring to individual things, and "all" taking up the same collectively. On this account, it is incorrect to explain it: "in every thing which ye do, do all in the name," *etc.* (MEYER), or that out of the doing in general the doing in particular proceeds (SCHENKEL). [EADIE makes the plural "individualing" also.—R.] The repetition as well as the position of πάν, together with the giving of a category ("in word or deed"), and the marking of the individual acts (ὅ τι) as well as the conditional form (ἐὰν ποιῆτε) require that it be understood of the entire action (BENGEL: *facitis lato sensu ponitur, ut etiam τὸ loqui incendat*) and this should be "in the name of the Lord Jesus." This is joined by "and" to "the word of Christ" (ver. 16). In addition to His Word, His Name, His Person should be availing to us; the former in us, and we in the latter, as in the life-sphere dearest to us, out of which we never go, the element which we cannot lack. See Eph. v. 20; Phil. ii. 10. The variation from "Christ" (ver. 16) and "Jesus" here makes us think of the model of the Incarnate One in the form of a servant. "In the name" is not "with invocation of" (CHRYSOSTOM and others). BENGEL extends it too far: *ut perinde sit, ac si Christus faciat, ver.* 11, *vel certi ut Christo omnia probetis.*

Giving thanks to God the Father by him.—The participle refers to the mood which should ever attend their "doing" (see ii. 7; Eph. v. 20), and which expresses itself in hymn and song. The repetition (vers. 15–17) marks the importance of "giving thanks." On "God the Father," see Eph. i. 3; v. 20; vi. 23; Col. i. 2. As "Father" is without any closer defini-

tion, it means of course, "of Jesus." [ALFORD, however, justly remarks: "the words must be taken as approximating in sense to that more technical meaning which they now bear, without exclusive reference to either our Lord or ourselves."—R.]—Δι' αὐτοῦ, "through him," is, according to Eph. v. 20,="in the name of the Lord," marking more strongly the mediation of the thanksgiving, the Christian sentiment (Rom. i. 8; vii. 25). There is nothing here to indicate opposition to angel-worship (THEODORET, BAEHR). [ALFORD: "'through Him,' as the one channel of all communication between God and ourselves, whether of grace coming to us, or of thanks coming from us. 'No man cometh unto the Father but by me' (δι' ἐμοῦ), Jno. xiv. 6." MEYER: "For Jesus, as the personal, historical Mediator of the Messianic Salvation through His atoning work, is therefore for the Christian consciousness the *Mediator* of thanksgiving; He it is, through *whose* favor the Christian can and does give thanks."—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Conduct determined by condition.** The Christian is "elect," "holy," "beloved." In the first there is a negative reference to the mass and world, out of which he is taken, in the second a positive reference to the same, asserting that he is consecrated to God, while the third declares, positively also, that he is an object of the love of God; the first denotes simply the occurred fact, the third gives prominence to the continued effect, while the second sets forth the *status*. The relation is constantly defined as passive; the Christian has experienced something, without previous merit or meritorious assistance. This conditions and promotes his conduct, with thankful zeal, in order to show in response what he has experienced, *viz.*, love. [The Apostle here as always (comp. Rom. viii.; Eph. i.) treats of "election" as a fact, which is made known to us, in order to awaken love in us. It is doubtless necessary that it be at times handled polemically and dogmatically, but he uses it most like Paul, who speaks of it as a fact, revealed by God, evidenced as true of persons by corresponding facts, *viz.*, Divine acts of grace which make men "holy and beloved," and in itself an act of Divine grace, which the Christian can so apprehend as to derive from it a constant motive to such Christian graces as the Apostle here enumerates. So far from being made thereby harsh, proud and unforgiving, they "*therefore*" put on bowels of mercy, kindness, humbleness of mind, *etc.*—R.]

2. *The new Christian condition or relation* is first of all a relation toward God, yet it at the same time influences essentially the relation between those concerned and transferred by it. It is precisely by this that it must prove itself, the religious by the social. First of all this relation of man to God brings a discord into the individual himself, because it divides him into the receding old man, and the advancing new man. The principle of the old man, selfishness, is made by this relation, to yield or become yielding to the principle of the new man, *viz.*, self-denying and world-denying love and the social virtues: mercy, kindness, humility, meekness, long-suffering, appear as necessary manifestations of the reality of the relations towards God. These virtues must show themselves toward the sins, faults and offences of a brother, just as God's love has shown and still shows itself toward us.

3. *Christian love is active.* In the social Christian virtues there is no weakness, effeminacy, indifference. It is not indifferent indolence but active *love*, energetically breaking out in these as its forms. The Apology for the Augsburg Confession, iii. § 110, rightly repels the assertion of the Romanists, that love justifies, since it does not establish the relation to God, only proves that it has been established, in and by the conduct toward the brethren.

4. *Christ*, in whom God's love has become and still becomes our portion, remains the only model, the exclusive norm.

5. *His peace in the heart*, *His word in the Church*, are the attendants of Christian love, the former as its tone, the latter as the means of promoting it; without the first, rest, confidence and joy were wanting, without the other, certainty, correctness and strength.

6. *The Christian Song*, deriving its contents and its growth from the word of God, promoted culture and progress in the Christian life; it is in itself a sermon from the Divine word, and has its value in the fact that it is such. The Christian entrusted with it, should use it in the wider and narrower circle of his associates. Produced by spiritual, natural endowments from the use of God's word and experience in life and heart, it is an excellent means of edification and growth for the new man. [The question of Psalmody and public praise, is to be settled by (ver. 16) and similar passages. *The word of Christ* is to be its substance; all that is not of the word of Christ is to be excluded, all that is, may be included. Hence the Psalter in the main source, but not the only one. "In all wisdom" is its mode, hence mere rhymes of a pious turn are not included. Its end is mutual edification, not entertainment, hence the hymn must be adapted to this end, and the singing of it "to edification." Those who cannot sing to edification may sing in their hearts, but the text implies that "this teaching and admonishing" is not the privilege of a few, but of Christians as a body. —R.]

7. *The walk in fellowship with Christ*, the practice of Christian virtues, advances us from the rudiments of a pupil to the perfection of a master. Not for merit, but for growth, Christian walk and Christian virtue are indispensable.

8. *Gratitude*, corresponding with the status into which we have been brought, with the glory of our relation to God, is most important and constant in Christian conduct. [Hence the excellence of those symbols, which treat of Christian morality under the head of the gratitude of God for redemption. See Heidelberg Catechism. This view guards alike against the extremes of antinomianism and legalism.—R.]

* [I have thus attempted to retain the neatness of Braune's sentence: "*Das Verhalten ist durch das Verhältniss bestimmt*," with indifferent success.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The Christian's station, ornament, strength, tone and weapon.—All morality takes its rise in religion, which is essentially love, given of God, who gave Himself and accepted us, or peace, in which all the antagonisms within the personality of the man himself in his conscience and will, or between himself and the world or his neighbor, or the nearest of all, *i. e.*, God the Lord Himself, was and is taken away.—Love is not a garment, that can be thrown over other virtues, but the soul of all to hold them together, their germ and impulse, their strength and beauty.—Ought the word of God to do well in you, then live in it, and let it live into you.—It is rudeness of mind to have no taste for the sacred poetry of the Church, the flowering of the Divine word in a gifted human soul, and a misfortune to have no benefit of it in the joy and sorrow of life.—A stamp you must have, lo, nothing is current in his eyes but His own Image.

STARKE:—Nothing gives the devil so much room to come into the heart as hatred and anger; God's children drive out both by meekness and spit on the embers, so that they may not break out into a fire.—He who bids us put up the sword, allows us still a shield for our protection; He who has commanded us to be as doves, has desired that we be "wise as serpents."—A little child, that falls so often and so easily, is lifted up and carried; so gently and tenderly must weak Christians be dealt with. The world sets itself to righting and fighting, if attacked even by a cross word; but a Christian overcomes all by forgiving and yielding; he yields his own right [not the right, however,] and does not think of revenging himself.—That the wolf devours the lamb is nothing uncommon, but that one lamb eats another is deplorable and unnatural; we who are Christ's sheep will cherish love toward one another.—Behold the necessity of household devotion. All others have their assemblies, merchants, mechanics, *etc.*, yes even the Godless, that they may mock at God and His word, should not believers then establish their holy assemblies?—We must thank God not only for His benefits, but also for His fatherly chastisements. "Both in His gifts and in His chastisements, praise Him, who either wins thee by giving, that thou mayest not want, or punishes thee when wandering, that thou mayest not perish" (AUGUSTINE).

SCHLEIERMACHER:—Christian social life: 1) what the deeds peculiar to the new man are; 2) what is distributed to each by virtue of these peculiarities of the new man; 3) the common rule for every one.—Controversy does not divide love and is not against the Christian spirit, if it only proceeds from a desire after nothing save what is true and right.—Love "the bond of perfectness:" 1) by which all imperfections are balanced; 2) by which all that bears in itself only the appearance of the new man, not its true spirit, is overcome; 3) by which we become helpful to others.

PASSAVANT:—Forbearance may be difficult in certain cases; forgiveness is harder still.—However necessary this gift (God's word) from above is, it will be learned from daily experience, that the Christians here and there are a very sensitive folk, not permitting themselves to be easily admonished or exhorted, hence the so frequent halts and retreats.—The first Christians from among the Jews soon found in their Psalms from earlier ages, thoughts and words for the later inward experiences, for the thanksgiving, praise and adoration of their new life; and those who came out of heathenism, listened with wonder, when these words of the sacred singers were transferred into their own language, and learned thence the quiet joys and devotions of God's children in Israel. But soon too under their beautiful sky new Psalms and hymns in their own Greek tongue were born out of the deep inspiration and the holy and happy feelings of their redeemed souls. This glorious gift of spiritual song contributed greatly to the spread of the pure gospel in the age of the Reformation. The great Reformer of the Germans with his friends soon became their choristers, and it is a precious privilege to follow them and so many God-inspired men of after days in singing these beautiful Psalms and sweet hymns.

GENZKEN:—The choice communion garment of the children of God: 1) who gives it to them (ver. 15); 2) how it is woven (vers. 12–15); 3) how we should put it on.—HARLESS:—The proper self-education for the maintenance of divine love and divine peace: 1) constant practice in obedience to God's word; 2) sanctification of all our doings in the name of the Lord Jesus; 3) unceasing thanksgiving for God's unmerited grace in Christ.—SCHNUR:—Spiritual songs: 1) Eagles of Christianity; 2) missionaries of Protestantism; 3) heart-preachers of our nation; 4) mouth of our worship; 5) the Apostles in our houses; 6) the crown of our congregations.—WOLF:—The comfort and joy of the Christian in spiritual songs. They serve: 1) as witnesses of the truth from all stations for the strengthening of our faith; 2) as confessions from the inner life of experienced Christians for the soothing of our spirits; 3) as awakening voices of the Spirit to enliven our own meditation.—KÖHLER:—The new man, as St. Paul depicts him, outshines all the lustre of the world! 1) His richly-colored garment; 2) his golden girdle; 3) his heart's peace; 4) the weapons of his hand.—PRÖHLE:—Bible and hymn book, two precious household treasures; 1) their worth; 2) their use.—Love in all human unions, the most perfect bond: 1) the noblest; 2) the gentlest; 3) the firmest.—Exhortation to Christian families to engage in family worship; it is 1) a venerable custom inherited from our fathers, though unfortunately disappearing from many houses; 2) deeply grounded in the character of Christianity, as well as in the nature of the family circle; 3) of the most blessed influence upon the home life itself.

[BEVERIDGE:—Ver. 17. Doing all in the name of the Lord Jesus. 1) What is meant by "the name of the Lord Jesus." *a.* Lord of all, *b.* Jesus, Saviour. *c.* Lord Jesus by the Incarnation. *d.* Mighty works in His name. 2) And we ought to do all, *etc.*, *a.* only what God commands or allows. *b.* in a firm faith in His Holy name. *c.* for His glory. 3) Instances of things thus done in God's word. Religious assemblies, Sacra-

ments, Thanksgiving, Censures of the church, Resisting the devil, even giving a cup of cold water. All that a Christian *may* do, can be done in His name.—R.]

[BURKITT:—Ver. 12. Humility is a certain evidence of our holiness, because it is a great part of our holiness.—Ver. 13. He must have no friends, that will have a friend with no faults, consequently Christians stand in need of forgiveness from each other.—Ver. 14. 1) The upper garment is larger and broader than the rest; so ought charity to extend itself to all persons and upon all occasions. 2) The upper garment is usually fairer than the rest; so doth charity shine brightest amongst all the graces. 3) The upper garment distinguishes the general orders and degrees of men; thus Christians are known by love, as by a livery; it is the bond that Christ's sincere disciples wear.—Ver. 16. If the heart and affections be not stirred in this duty of singing, the outward grace, though never so graceful availeth nothing.—R.]

[HENRY:—Ver. 12. They who owe so much to mercy, ought to be merciful to all who are proper objects of mercy.—There must not only be an humble carriage but an humble mind.—Ver. 13. We need the same good turn from others which we are obliged to show them.—Ver. 15. The work of thanksgiving to God is such a sweet and pleasant work, that it will help to make us sweet and pleasant towards all men.—Ver. 16. The gospel is the word of Christ, which is come to us; but that is not enough, it must *dwell* in us, or *keep house*, as a master, who has a right to prescribe and direct to all under his roof.—Ver. 17. They who do all things in Christ's name, will never want matter of thanksgiving to God the Father.—R.]

[EADIE:—Ver. 14. "Love the bond of perfectness." Bound up in this zone, every Christian excellence fills its own place, and keeps it, and the whole character is sound, does not distort itself by excess, nor enfeeble itself by defect.—Ver. 15. A peace, which is not the peace of Christ, is often rudely disturbed, for it is but a dream and a slumber in the midst of volcanic powers, which are employing the time in gathering up their energies for a more awful conflict.—Ver. 16. Such ought to be the habitual respect to Christ's authority, such the constant and practical influence of His word within us, that even without reference to Him, or express consultation of Him, all we say or do should be said and done in His Spirit.—Art, science, literature, politics and business, should be all baptized into the spirit of Christ.—R.]

[BARNES:—Ver. 16. He who is permitted to make the *hymns* of a church need care little who preaches, or who makes the creed.—Ver. 17. We are to engage in every duty, not only in the name of Christ, but with thankfulness for the privilege of acting so that we may honor Him.—SCHENKEL: —The victory of peace in the heart: 1) It comes *from Christ;* 2) it is accomplished *in the church;* 3) it is constantly attended by thanksgiving.—The proper Christian congregational singing: 1) The choice of hymns; 2) the kind of singing; 3) the source from which it should spring; 4) the end, which it should aim at.—The nature of Christian gratitude as shown: 1) In that, *for which* the Christian is thankful; 2) In *whom* he thanks; 3) In *whose name* he gives thanks.—R.]

---

3. Specific exhortations.

CHAPTER III. 18—IV. 1.

a) To wives and husbands.

(CHAP. III. 18, 19.)

18 Wives, submit yourselves unto your own [omit own][1] husbands, as it is fit [or as it
19 should be][2] in the Lord. Husbands, love *your*[3] wives, and be not bitter [or embittered] against them.

[1] Ver. 18.—Some MSS. have inserted, probably from the parallel passage [Eph. v. 22], *τοῖς ἰδίοις*, omitted in ℵ. A. B. C. and others.
[2] Ver. 18.—['Ανῆκεν, imperfect, Ellicott renders as above.—R.]
[3] Ver. 19.—ℵ. A. B. and others omit ὑμῶν after γυναῖκας. [Retained by Lachmann, Meyer and others. In any case, "*your*" is required by our English idiom.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 18. **Wives, submit yourselves unto your husbands.**—See on Eph. v. 22. Αἱ γυναῖκες is found there also, while instead of ὑποτάσσεσθε, *ὑποτασσόμενοι* must there be supplied from the verse preceding. Τοῖς ἀνδράσιν does not refer to men as a category, but the given, proper men [*i. e.*, "husbands," as in E. V.—R.].

As it should be in the Lord.—The imperfect denotes this pre-supposition: that what was exhorted, was not as yet attended to (as Eph. v. 4. WINER'S *Gram.* p. 254); hence it means: "as it should be," corresponding with the fellowship which has in Christ its life-sphere. This is applied somewhat differently in Eph. v. 22: "as

unto the Lord." There the dignity of the man is made more prominent, by comparing the husband to Christ and the wife to the Church. It is incorrect to join "in the Lord" to "submit" (CHRYSOSTOM and others), or to take ἀνῆκεν as a perfect with a present signification (HUTHER, BLEEK also).

Husbands, love your wives.—See Eph. v. 25.—**And be not bitter against them.**—[ELLICOTT renders μὴ κικραίνεσθε, "be not embittered"—referring it to a state of mind, rather than to specific acts.—R.] This special warning concerns a foul blot in married life, when the husband, as head of the house, not as head of the wife, not in love to her, but ruled by the old man, either shows bitterness in word or deed, or in tone, to the wife, should she be wanting in humility and submission, or have violated or disregarded the household right of the husband; or treats her with indifference, neglect or harshness, without any fault of hers, from the cares and weariness of business, or the changing moods of the flesh, or mere habit. The preposition πρός, "against," denotes the direction only; it does not necessarily imply hostility towards the wife; she need only learn from his conduct, that in his false self-love he does not love her as himself, but as one unregenerate might do. BENGEL: *πικρία odium amori mixtum; multi, qui foris erga omnes humani sunt, tamen domi in uxorem ac liberos, quos videlicet non tement, occulta facile acerbitate utuntur, quæ ubi vincetur, specimen est magnæ mansuetudinis.*

[STEIGER would account for this special exhortation here and in Eph. by the supposition that the doctrine of the false teachers had developed a dangerous licentiousness. But had there been a polemic reference, the Apostle would have entered into the subject more fully, and not been content with these simple exhortations (MEYER). The social morality of these Asiatic cities was undoubtedly debased, but this was the case throughout the whole Roman empire. From this briefer form of the exhortation, ELLICOTT infers that our Epistle was written before that to the Ephesians.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

Compare notes on Eph. v. 22, 23.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—That there are so few wedlocks which are properly regulated and rightly enjoyed on both sides, arises usually from the fact of the wife's avoiding submission, or of the husband's not knowing how to govern properly.—The male sex has usually more fire than the female, so that it can easily happen that a man in his power goes too far and deals too hardly with his wife.

RIEGER:—Most of the mistakes of married life are consequences of the sins of youth, especially of those seductive blandishments under which the marriages were formed.—Even that which is polluted, should any one in a time of ignorance be betrayed into a dubious union, may be washed away, cleansed and sanctified.—He who knows and considers his loveless heart, as God's word discloses to men their natural evil disposition, and by these two words especially: hard-heartedness and anger, will dig deeply and lay well the foundation in his love.—Negligence in affection is itself the first rupture of the marriage tie. But in love we have a fortress that can stand many an assault.

PASSAVANT:—It is exceedingly painful and saddening, to be forced by the reports of missionaries, to see at what a low grade of intelligence and in what a sorrowful condition in general, woman is kept among heathen nations—the Birmese perhaps and the Karens excepted—with what neglect and contempt and abuse she is treated.—Over the grave of many a great man, of many a sleeping saint, often too of one snatched as a brand from the burning, stands in lines, that angels read: he had a pious mother!—The man is the head; a high vocation, a higher power and strength, and a great responsibility! It pre-supposes quiet wisdom, earnest character, rational sway with benevolence—bearing, forbearing, patience, with mildness and friendliness;—and this cannot exist with a firm, faithful, ever equal love, without holy love toward the wife's soul, before the Lord.—This exhortation of the Apostle pre-supposes also, that there will be many an opportunity of becoming embittered, and that the wife's nature will be the occasion of it. Yet the husband should not allow himself to be overcome by the weaker vessel; but here there must be humility and bowing of heart before God every day.

HEUBNER:—Bitterness steals upon us at the very first in the closest unions, as we discover the weaknesses of another, or where there are many hastinesses. The husband can be easily led into this, if the wife does not gratify his wish.

[SCHENKEL:—Why Christian morality requires the submission of the wife in the household.—The dangers of bitterness in married life: 1) Its extent; 2) Its causes; 3) Its results.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—The regulation of household life. It should be so regulated, that 1) all that is done, is done in the name of Jesus; 2) that thanks are in every way given to God, through the conduct of our household life.—R.]

b) To children and parents.

(Chap. III. 20, 21.)

20 Children, obey *your* parents in all things: for this is well pleasing unto [in][1] the
21 Lord. Fathers, provoke not your children *to anger* [omit *to anger*],[2] lest they be
discouraged [disheartened].[3]

[1] Ver. 20.—["The reading of Rec., τῷ Κυρίῳ, has not the support of any uncial MS., and is rejected by all modern editors" (Ellicott). Tischendorf (eds. 2 and 7) reads ἐστιν εὐάρεστον, but the order of ℵ. A. B. C. D. E. is εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν, followed by Lachmann, Meyer, Alford, Ellicott.—R.]

[2] Ver. 21.—Instead of ἐρεθίζετε (B. and others,) ℵ. A. and others have παροργίζετε, undoubtedly taken from Eph. vi. 4. [Lachmann and Scholz adopt the latter reading. The E. V. inserts "to anger"—now unnecessary, since "provoke" implies this in modern usage.—R.]

[3] Ver. 21.—[Ἀθυμῶσιν, "disheartened," Eadie, Alford, Ellicott. Older versions render: "made feeble-hearted," "of a desperate mind."—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 20. **Children, obey your parents in all things.**—See Eph. vi. 1. "In all things," κατὰ πάντα, here definitely expresses what is indicated in the parallel passage by the phrase, "in the Lord;" it is not to be limited (Oecumenius). It sets forth the principle, the rule, exceptions being left out of view (Meyer). [Eadie suggests, that as the reference is to Christian parents, who were to govern in a Christian spirit, the Apostle takes heed of an exception. On the exceptions see Bish. Taylor, *Duct. Dub.* III. 5. Ellicott remarks that ὑπακούειν includes not merely submission to authority, but obedience to a command. Titt. *Syn.* I. p. 193.—R.]

For this is well-pleasing in the Lord.—(Eph. vi. 1, "right".) Hence the reference here is to judgment and complacency, there to precept and authority. "In the Lord," before Him, as He looks at the matter. We need not supply τῷ θεῷ (Rom. xii. 2) in thought (De Wette), nor take ἐν κυρίῳ as the Christian qualification (Meyer) [Alford]; the former is not warranted by the context, the latter is contrary to usage and indistinct in itself. [Ellicott is more exact: the preposition defines the sphere in which the τὸ εὐάρεστον was especially felt and evinced to be so.—R.]

Ver. 21. **Fathers, provoke not your children.**—(See Eph. vi. 4: παροργίζετε.) The verb is used, 2 Cor. ix. 2, in a good sense, here in a bad sense; what is forbidden occurs through severe, unjust, capricious treatment. [We might render: "do not irritate your children."—R.] The motive for the warning is found in the result, which is marked as fixed and certain: **lest they be disheartened.**—Bengel: "A broken spirit, the bane of youth." There is a lack of affection and confidence, pleasure and power for good and against evil.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

Comp. on Eph. vi. 1–4.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Starke:—Disobedient children offend not only their parents, but God Himself; therefore they have no prosperity.—Children are not given for the service of parents, but parents are ordained for the benefit of children.—Actual chastisement should never be resorted to, until the child has been convinced of its guilt and well merited punishment, and God been earnestly implored to bless the infliction. The additional advantage thus gained is that meanwhile one's rising passion can be allayed and the punishment inflicted with proper moderation. The child, too, is thereby shown that the chastisement springs from love, and is more of an advantage than a punishment.—In the discipline of children, ignorance, weakness, hastiness, thoughtlessness and childish character must be distinguished from wanton wickedness.

Rieger:—Our heavenly Father, the Father of our spirits, Himself carefully guards against our becoming disheartened under His chastisement, and nothing rejoices Him more than that we "cast not away our confidence;" and so also in the relations of parents and children, much depends upon our not being rendered morose by the faults, but taking courage in final triumph.

Passavant:—In this obedience of children from the very cradle lies the foundation and beginning of all good discipline, of all welfare and blessing, external and internal, in the heart, in the family, in the state, in all phases and circles of social life.—Has many a yoke of early years been borne in the patience of faith, with what a peaceful gaze does one look back! Those who have grown old should again take it upon them, and as children kneel before their parents.

Heubner:—Christian nurture dare not intimidate, but should promote a noble frankness and openness.

[Burkitt:—God takes a mighty pleasure in the performance of relative duties; they are not only pleasing, but well-pleasing to Him; we are no more really than what we are relatively in

the account of God; that which we call the power of godliness, consists in a conscientious performance of relative duties.—R.]

[HENRY:—Ver. 21. Let not your authority over them be exercised with rigor and severity, but with kindness and gentleness: lest you raise their passions and discourage them in their duty, and by holding the reins too strait, make them fly out with the greater fierceness. It is by the tenderness of parents, and dutifulness of children, that God ordinarily furnishes His Church with a *seed to serve Him*, and propagates religion from age to age.—R.]

[EADIE:—The child should feel that the punishment is not the result of fretful anger.—Children teased and irritated lose heart, renounce every endeavor to please, or render at best but a soulless obedience.—The twig is to be bent with caution, not broken in the efforts of a rude and hasty zeal. —SCHENKEL:—The evil effects of too severe a training of children. 1) In what they consist 2) Whence they arise.—R.]

---

c) To servants and masters.

(CHAP. III. 22—IV. 1.)

22 Servants,[1] obey in all things *your* masters according to the flesh; not with eye-
service [eye services],[2] as menpleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God [the
23 Lord].[3] And whatsoever ye do, do *it* heartily [whatever ye do, do it from the
24 heart],[4] as to the Lord, and not unto men; Knowing that of the Lord ye shall re-
25 ceive the reward of the inheritance: [.] for ye serve [Serve ye][5] the Lord Christ.
But [For][6] he that doeth wrong shall receive[7] for the wrong which he hath done:
and there is no respect of persons.

IV. 1 Masters, give unto *your* servants that which is just and equal; knowing that
ye also have a Master in heaven.

[1] Ver. 22.—[Modern English commentators render δοῦλοι. "slaves" or "bondmen." As Braune makes it include (here and Eph. i. 1,) all servants, bond or free, the E. V. is sufficiently explicit.—R.]

[2] Ver. 22.—The reading, ὀφθαλμοδουλείαις, is well attested by ℵ. C. K. L. It is *lectio difficilior*, while the singular is probably taken from Eph vi. 6. [Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott and others adopt the plural mainly on critical grounds; the singular is attested by A. B. D. F., adopted by Lachmann, Meyer, Eadie, Wordsworth.—On the different shade of meaning see EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[3] Ver. 22.—ℵ. A. B. C. and others have κύριον; θεόν is weakly supported.

[4] Ver. 23.—ℵ. A. B. C. and others read ὃ ἐάν; the other reading, καὶ πᾶν ὅ, τι ἐάν, is not sufficiently supported. ['Ἐκ ψυχῆς, "from the heart," Rhem.—R.]

[5] Ver. 24.—[Rec. inserts γάρ on insufficient authority. The verb δουλεύετε is imperative; Meyer, Eadie, Alford, Ellicott, Vulgate, *etc.*—R.]

[6] Ver. 25.—ℵ. A. B. C. and others read ὁ γάρ. Others read δέ [followed by E. V. This and the reading above rejected (ver. 24) stand or fall together, on exegetical as well as critical grounds.—R.]

[7] Ver. 25.—ℵ. A. C. and others [Alford; Wordsworth;] read κομιεῖται; B. and others [Tischendorf, Lachmann, Meyer, Ellicott], κομίσεται.

[8] IV. 1.—Οὐρανῷ is established by ℵ. A. B. C. and others, instead of οὐρανοῖς. [Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth, adopt the singular; the plural apparently taken from Eph. vi. 9.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 22. **Servants.**—This point is treated in the most detailed manner, as though this were the state of the Church in the main: as Eph. vi. 5–8; also Tit. ii. 9, 10; 1 Pet. ii. 18–25 (comp. i. 18–21). Comp. also 1 Cor. i. 20, and 1 Pet. i. 1, according to which Peter wrote to the Church at Colosse also. The view of SCHENKEL: "it is possible, as MEYER supposes, that this (*i. e.*, the minuteness) was occasioned by the flight and conversion of the slave Onesimus, a native of and fugitive from Colosse," is groundless. [Braune's opinion that δοῦλοι includes all servants, bond or free, seems correct (see Eph. vi. 5), but the free servants were the exception then. "Nothing is *said* for or against slavery in this passage," whatever may be implied.—R.]

Obey in all things your masters according to the flesh.—See Eph. vi. 5. "In all things" (κατὰ πάντα), as in ver. 20, is new. [WORDSWORTH remarks on this phrase in ver. 20 and here: "An example of a precept proceeding *on the charitable supposition* that the other party will do its duty; for if Parents and Masters order any thing contrary to God's law, then Children and Servants must 'obey God rather than men' (Acts v. 29)."—R.] Contrasted with "masters according to the flesh" is One "according to the spirit," "in heaven" (comp. ver. 24; iv. 1).

Not with eye services, as men-pleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing the Lord.—"Not with eye services" marks by the use of the plural, the individual manifestations of eye service; found only here and in Eph. vi. 6 (singular). ["Here the concrete acts, there the abstract spirit" (ALFORD).—R.] It is contrasted

with "but in singleness of heart," which is wanting in the dishonesty of "eyeservice;" "as men-pleasers" is contrasted with "fearing the Lord." ["The Lord," κύριον, κατ' ἐξοχήν, κατὰ πνεῦμα; the turn of the thought in the correct reading is lost both in the E. V. and the rendering above. MEYER: "The obedience of the Christian slave becomes man-pleasing towards his master, and eye-service in appearance, if it be not subordinated to the fear of Christ, the higher Master, and accordingly conditioned by this."—R.] The same words as in Eph. vi. 5, 6, but more sharply conceived. [EADIE, referring this to slaves exclusively, remarks: "The Apostle does not speak vaguely, but hits upon those vices which slavery is so apt to engender—indolence, eye-service and reluctance in labor."—R.]

Ver. 23. **Whatever ye do.**—Whatever ye do in servitude (BENGEL). The verse relates to individual and little things. See Eph. vi. 8.—**Do it from the heart, as to the Lord and not unto men.**—Ἐκ ψυχῆς, standing first for emphasis, and demanding glad, willing action, refers back to "in singleness of heart;" "as to the Lord," demanding constant mindfulness of the present heavenly Master, to "fearing the Lord;" while the absolute negative "not (οὐκ) unto men" refers to "men-pleasers." [MEYER: "*As to the Lord*, the point of view of the doing; this should be regarded as taking place for Christ, as service rendered to Him. And the relation to the human master (ἀνθρώποις, dative of the category) should not, in this method of regarding it, be taken into the account at all,—on the principle of not serving two masters,—hence οὐκ is not relatively, but absolutely negative." —R.]

Ver. 24. **Knowing.**—["Seeing ye know," *da Ihr wisset.*—R.]—The motive for such conduct (Eph. vi. 8).—**That of the Lord ye shall receive the reward [or recompense] of the inheritance.**—"That" sets forth the tenor of this Christian consciousness. "Of (ἀπό) the Lord" denotes that the Lord is the Possessor, Source and Origin, while παρά (Eph. vi. 8) indicates the immediate communication through the Lord (WINER's *Gram.* p. 343). "Ye shall receive" points to the future, its signification referring to a reception of that which is lacking. "The recompense" (ἀνταπόδοσιν, only here; Rom. xi. 9: ἀνταπόδομα) with the article denotes a recompense in prospect, while the preposition (ἀντι) indicates that it is one compensating for the present privations by means of an inheritance. which is wanting to and yet wanted by the slave here; for "of the inheritance" (κληρονομίας) is an epexegetical genitive (WINER's *Gram.* p. 494), as Jas. i. 12; Acts ii. 10. This inheritance is the full salvation, heritage of heaven, "although in this world you do not have an inheritance, yet you have part of the inheritance passing from the Master to the free" (BENGEL).

Serve ye the Lord [Master] Christ.—The Apostle's comprehensive conclusion. "Christ, who recompenses those serving Himself" (BENGEL). It is incorrect to join "of the inheritance" with "the Lord" (serve the Master of the inheritance), and also wrong to take the verb as indicative [as is done in the E. V., to which the incorrect reading γάρ has probably led. —R.]; neither find any reason or necessity in the context.

Ver. 25. In view of the importance of this matter, another reason is added: **For he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done.**—The meaning of this general proposition (*locus communis*) clearly is that every one reaps what he sows (WINER's *Gram.* p. 576); sowing wrong, he reaps wrong, as he reaps good when he sows good (Gal. vi. 8). This confirms the exhortation to serve Christ, for slaves and domestic servants alike; from it they should deduce the conclusion, to gladly obey. It is "contrary to the meaning," not to apply it to the slaves (MEYER, who renders ἀδικεῖν, to injure, limiting it to the masters. SCHENKEL). Paul admonishes the slaves here, while he encourages them Eph. vi. 8. [The reference is doubtful. ELLICOTT, ALFORD follow MEYER, and refer ἀδικεῖν to the master. The proposition is undoubtedly general, and has an application to both master and slave. The context seems to indicate the latter as the reference intended by the Apostle.—R.]—"Receive" refers to the judgment of the Lord, in which the "inheritance" is concerned, and "wrong which he hath done" (ὃ ἠδίκησε) marks the connection of the wrong on earth, and condemnation, destruction in eternity, where sin has transferred itself in its results and consequences.

And there is no respect of persons.—This means in this connection, that the low and insignificant as well as the high and distinguished are equal before God. The former often boast themselves of their poverty, as if on account of this they must be finally blessed and receive reward; "the insignificant often think, that they are to be spared on account of their insignificance" (BENGEL). This is not far-fetched (*aus der Luft gegriffen*, MEYER), but taken from the context. Eph. vi. 9 refers to masters. [The idea is indeed common among men, that God respects not the person of a rich man, but that of a poor man.—R.]

IV. 1. **Masters,** οἱ κύριοι.—See Eph. vi. 9.—**Give unto your servants that which is just and equal.**—Τὸ δίκαιον is what belongs to the slave of right—not historical, human right, but according to the regulations given within the domain of creation, and the rights thus set forth; hence what belongs to them as God's creatures, as human beings. "And" something truer and higher; "that which is equal," τὴν ἰσότητα, denotes the equality ordained within the domain of Redemption, according to which the redeemed are brethren (Philem. 16); this parity they should show in their treatment of the slaves. It is incorrect to regard it as merely "equity" (STEIGER, BLEEK) [ALFORD, "fairness"—R.], or "impartial treatment" (ERASMUS and others). [ELLICOTT says of the view of MEYER as given above: "This is ingenious and plausible, but not satisfactory," from its association with δίκαιον. There is this objection to it, that it limits the duty to Christian masters in their dealings with Christian slaves. See EADIE *in loco.* Notice the "dynamic" form of the middle παρέχεσθε: supply on your side, as far as you are concerned.—R.]

The motive is added: **knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven**, who is over you, and your Almighty, Omniscient, Just and Eternal Master. See on Eph. vi. 9.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

Compare Eph. vi. 5–9.

[*These precepts in force where there are no slaves.* Through God's merciful Providence, the application of these precepts to a state of slavery has become unnecessary among us. But the relations of master and servant, employer and employee still exist, and there is as much need for the application of the Apostle's words to those who occupy these relative positions, as to servants and masters in the relation existing at Colosse. When we consider how much is said of the conflict between labor and capital, how large a part of the comfort and happiness of women in the household depends on the right conduct of these relations, we may be glad that Paul writes not merely for a state of slavery, but for all masters and servants, and at the same time regret that social science has so often attempted to settle troublesome questions of this kind, without the aid of Christianity. A large class are becoming not only unchristian but antichristian, because Christianity, which abolished slavery, has not yet been thoroughly applied to the relations of labor and capital.—Too many fancy that God is no respecter of the person of a capitalist, but takes the working man's part, whether justice be on his side or not.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—God in His wisdom has so classed men, that some are subjects and servants, while others command and should rule. This is not contrary to the equality of Christians, or to Christian brotherhood; they are still one in Christ. Therefore servants should not have so great a dislike to service, but serve with alacrity and with the heartier obedience, particularly as they are not slaves, but free.

RIEGER:—Him who fears God and honors God by keeping His commands, God honors in turn by giving him a suitable respect in the government of his own house. Men-pleasing and eye-service at first succeeds very well, but in the long run it becomes intolerable.

PASSAVANT:—A Christian may well tremble as he looks at his servant and asks himself: Why am I his master? Why is he my servant? The answer is: That I may take him just as he is, so bear and forbear with him as to sweeten his servile condition with all lenity and consideration, as to sanctify his calling to him, helping him out of his natural or habitual sins.

HEUBNER:—The character and doings of the Christian are soulful (ἐκ ψυχῆς). The doings of others are cold and dead.—Unrighteous servants will be punished too; God does not let Himself be led by weak sympathy into indulgence.

[SCHLEIERMACHER:—All improvements in the social relations of men must proceed, not from a disturbance of order and a violent throwing off of obedience, but from the greater power of love. —BURKITT:—Wink at some trivial miscarriages of servants. He must keep no servant that will have a servant with no faults.—R.]

[EADIE:—Ver. 22. Refractoriness on the part of the slave would at once have embittered his life, and brought discredit on the new religion which he possessed; but active and cheerful discharge of all duty would both benefit himself, promote his comfort and recommend Christianity. —Duplicity is the vice which the slave uses as his shield.—IV. 1. Let the great Master's treatment of you be your model of your treatment of them.—(Abridged) Three positions of the Apostle fatal to slavery: 1) He denies that slaves are an inferior caste (Homer, Aristotle); 2) certain duties to slaves spring from natural right; 3) in the Christian Church there is neither "bond nor free." Master and slave were alike the free servants of a common Lord in heaven.—R.]

---

4. Concluding exhortation.

Respecting prayer, walk and speech.

(CHAP. IV. 2–6.)

2 Continue [Persevere][1] in prayer, and watch in the same with thanksgiving;
3 Withal praying also for us, that God would open unto us a door of utterance [lit. of
4 the word], to speak the mystery of Christ, for which[2] I am also in bonds: That I
5 may make it manifest, as I ought to speak. Walk in wisdom toward them that are
6 without, redeeming the time [καιρόν, the opportunity].[3] Let your speech *be* always
with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every
man.

[1] Ver. 2.—[Προσκαρτερεῖτε; the E. V. is scarcely strong enough.—R.]
[2] Ver. 3.—ℵ. A. C. D. E. K. L. and others read δι' ὅ; B. and a few others δι' ὅν.
[3] Ver. 5.—[See EXEG. NOTES below and on Eph. v. 16.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The connection: These three exhortations do not apply to particular classes, but are of a general character. In fact they refer to that service in the gospel, which each member has to render; for they point to the ways in which the hindrances to that service may be removed. They are based upon the thought: if you do your duty as Christians in general and particular alike, you render service not merely as members of the congregation, but as servants of the Church, you are not merely to be regulated by the will and word of the Lord, but also do your part in helping others to do the same. This service is to be rendered by: Prayer, especially supplication for the Apostle, walk and speech. They are not therefore supplementary exhortations (MEYER), nor are they to be joined either to iii. 17, or to iv. 1—"ye have a Master in heaven" (SCHENKEL).

Prayer. Vers. 2–4. **Persevere in prayer.**—Like Acts i. 14; Rom. vii. 12. Καρτερέω, to be strong, πρός indicating the direction; it describes a strong persistence, an importuning of some one (Mark iii. 9; Acts viii. 13; x. 7). The meaning is the same as "pray without ceasing" (1 Thess v. 17).—**And watch in the same with thanksgiving.**—[*Lit*, "being watchful in it." —R.] The participle (γρηγοροῦντες) marks the modality of the perseverance in prayer; the verb enjoins lively circumspection according to the word of Christ: "watch and pray" (Matth. xxvi. 41; Mark xiv. 38). Comp. Eph. vi. 18; 1 Thess. v. 6; 1 Cor. xvi. 13; 1 Pet. v. 8. There should be watchfulness during the prayer ("in the same"), directed to God's benefits, thus "thanksgiving" would be united with it, if not as a constituent part (SCHENKEL), yet in the consciousness as a motive and tone (ii. 7; iii. 15, 17). [The first ἐν denotes the *sphere*, the second the *accompaniment*.—R.]. There is no warrant for joining "with thanksgiving" with "persevere" (BÖHMER).

Ver. 3. **Withal praying also for us.**—Eph. vi. 19, 20 is the parallel passage. "Withal" [ἅμα, at the same time—R.] denotes that this supplication should not be wanting as a constituted part of the prayer of the Colossians. "Us" (Eph. vi. 19, "me") includes not merely Timothy (MEYER and others), but other companions also, such as Epaphras. [The use of the singular in the immediate context forbids our limiting it to the Apostle himself. —R.]

That God would open unto us a door of the word—["That" (ἵνα) blends the purport and the purpose of the prayer, the latter being more prominent. ALFORD, ELLICOTT.—R.] Eph. vi. 19 speaks of "utterance" (στόμα), but this passage does not. "Door" according to 1 Cor. xvi. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 12, means "free activity;" it is not = στόμα (CALVIN, BENGEL and others), and includes more than "boldly" (CHRYSOSTOM), which ver. 4 sets forth. Paul thought of his freedom and his coming to Colosse (Philem. 22). ["The Apostle longed for liberty, not for itself, but for the opportunity which it gave him of preaching the gospel. The opening of the door of his prison would be the opening of a door of discourse." EADIE.—R.]

To speak the mystery of Christ.—The infinitive is epexegetical of λόγον, as ver. 6 (WINER'S *Gram.* p. 298). See Eph. vi. 19; iii. 4. [EADIE: "An infinitive of result;" MEYER, ALFORD, ELLICOTT; "infinitive of purpose." This is preferable, and is a form of the epexegetical infinitive. "Τοῦ Χριστοῦ is a genitive *subjecti*, the divine mystery included in the appearing and the redemptive act of Christ, since the divine decree of Redemption, concealed before it was made known through the gospel, was accomplished in the mission and work of Christ." MEYER.—R.]

For which I am also in bonds, ["I have been and am bound."—R.]—"For which" (δι' ὅ) refers to "mystery," the preaching of which had brought him into bonds, and on account of which too he desired liberty. The perfect denotes that the imprisonment still continues; and "also," that this is added to other afflictions; while his activity is not destroyed (Eph. vi. 20, "I am an ambassador in bonds"), it is very much limited. ["Also" marks the extreme to which he had proceeded in his evangelical labors (ELLICOTT)—R.]

Ver. 4. **That I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak.**—"That" (ἵνα) marks "make it manifest" as the end, the purpose of the "speaking," as the common object requires. "It" is "the mystery of Christ," and the "speaking" will "make manifest" this. Hence the clause depends neither on "I am in bonds" (BENGEL), nor "praying" (BEZA). Paul wishes liberty (the opening "of a door of the word"), in order to be able to make it manifest. "As I ought to speak" refers to the apostolic activity in going from city to city, land to land (Rom. i. 13, 14; xv. 16), with "boldness" presupposed. "Ought" refers then to the Divine call to the Apostolate among the Gentiles, which includes zeal and intrepid candor.

The walk. Ver. 5. **Walk in wisdom toward them that are without.**—After what was to take place in the supplication for the Apostle and to be done by him, follows what they had to do actually and immediately, and this is first of all "walk without word." Hence this exhortation is not added without special connection (MEYER). The element in which the Christian is to move with his conduct is placed emphatically first; "in wisdom" (see Eph. v. 15; i. 8; Col. i. 9, 28; ii. 23. Comp. Matt. x. 16). The direction of the walk is denoted by "toward them that are without" (1 Cor. v. 12, 13; 1 Thess. iv. 12; 1 Tim. iii. 7); those who do not belong to the church, to the believers.—**Redeeming the opportunity.**—The participle gives a closer definition of the walk, inhering in the wise walk, as the present indicates. See Eph. v. 16. Here τὸν καιρόν stands first, because each favorable point of time is to be made use of, for furthering the kingdom of God, and winning others by such use of it. LUTHER is inexact: accommodate yourselves to the time. It is incorrect to regard it as referring to the shortness of time (CHRYSOSTOM), to the evil time (CALVIN and others), or to deny the reference to those without (MEYER), which is contrary to the context.

The speech. Ver. 6. **Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt.**—The next means of intercourse, "your speech," is naturally in close connection; it is therefore to be regarded as directed toward "those without." It should "always" (πάντοτε, *i. e.*=ἑκάστοτε), according to the context ("every man"), toward well and evil-disposed people, at opportune and inopportune times (not as SCHENKEL thinks, in good or ill humor), have two peculiarities: "with grace," it should be invested with grace (Luke iv. 22; Eph. iv. 29) [ELLICOTT: χάρις was to be the *habitus orationis*. It does not mean Divine grace, but a result of it.—R.]; it should be "seasoned with salt." "Salt" has something sharp, energetic, but beneficial, which, as the perfect participle indicates, has been previously appropriated and continues to operate. According to the first peculiarity, the speech should not be repellant, but attractive; according to the second, not feeble and insipid, but apt, striking and interesting. The former has as its opposite, what is insolent and ugly, the latter, what is flat and powerless. The figurative expression is not therefore a strengthening or explanation of the literal one (MEYER). [The reference is not to the conservative power of salt, nor to wit, "Attic salt," but as salt makes food agreeable to the palate, so their speech should be commended to the hearers by a wholesome point and pertinency. ELLICOTT.—R.]

That ye may know, εἰδέναι, epexegetical to "speech," as λαλῆσαι (ver. 3). See WINER's *Gram.* p. 298. [ELLICOTT: "expressive of consequence." —R.]—**How ye ought to answer every man.**—"How" indicates that this respects the form; the correct substance is pre-supposed. "Ye ought to answer every man" refers to intercourse in conversation with heathen, unbelievers, as the context (ver. 5) demands. It is applicable to the questions of unprejudiced, inquiring or evil-disposed unbelievers about points of doctrine, moral principles, Christian things or persons, and ecclesiastical ordinances. Comp. Acts xvii. 18 sq.; xxiv. 24 sq.; xxviii. 21 sq.; 1 Pet. iii. 15.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

Comp. on Eph. vi. 18–20; on Eph. v. 15, 16; on Eph. iv. 29.

1. *Prayer* should have, as THOMAS AQUINAS says, three qualities, it should be assiduous, watchful and grateful. The perseverance, with which prayer uninterruptedly draws itself through all events, internal and external, like a thread, or encircles them like a chain, is its vital power; the watchfulness, the lively circumspection, the gratitude, are the quiet tone or firm basis of the same.

2. *Freedom* has no absolute value; the use and application made of it, gives it its value; and that just to the extent that in it the task set before its possessor is served or satisfied.

3. *Wisdom*, and that too in the silent walk, is demanded of the believer, toward the unbeliever, the opponent of the gospel; not from fear before him, but from solicitous love to those who should be won, should become what they are not as yet, brethren; from fear of God, who will save them also.

4. *In the speech of a Christian* in social intercourse with those, who are not yet or no longer brethren, but who may become so, two things are of importance with respect to Christian or ecclesiastical things: suavity and sharpness. The former depends on the character, the heart, the disposition, and the piety, the latter on the mind, the understanding, the culture and experience of the world; the former reckons upon benefiting, winning, the latter upon conviction, clearness, instruction; the one guards against unsatisfactory brevity, dogmatic harshness, injurious sharpness in wit or sarcasm; the other against gossipping length without meaning, garrulous pleasure without aim or end, tedious, flat and offensive talk without truth or shape.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—Prayer is the most excellent means of becoming skilled in all the duties of Christianity.—RIEGER:—Much depends not only upon what? but how? one speaks.—The Scriptures attach much importance to speech and the guarding of the tongue; and this has much influence upon the pollution or the unpolluted preservation of the rest of the walk.

GERLACH:—Salt is sharp, yet it gives to all food that pleasant taste, which renders it palatable. So the sharpness of Christian earnestness, of the fear of God's anger and punishment and of the desire for blessedness lends to all the words of the Christian their true grace and sweetness.—SCHLEIERMACHER:—Grace is that which attacks and befriends the soul: salt, the power of our words and life, that which penetrates the soul.

PASSAVANT:—The more trustful the prayer, the more open will the heart become for thanksgiving and praise; and the more thankful the heart, the more trustfully and filially will it pour itself out in prayer to the Lord.—Strong and firm, kind and pure, quiet and secure as those may be in heart and conscience, who stand without, they yet stand without, hindered by all sorts of spirits and by their own as well, exposed or given up to all change, all humors, all winds and storms, to a vain and perishing world separated from God, by which they are sooner or later deceived, misled and robbed, driven hither and thither now by waves and now by flames, where there is no help, no Helper and no God; they stand without that tabernacle of God among men, where alone truth and peace are to be found.—We may deal too imprudently, impatiently and roughly, without taking into account old habits and the stiff prejudices of years, unconcerned, whether we do good or harm, anger or appease by our demeanor, without showing any forbearance or affection toward those who have remained behind us, thus forgetting that once we were and lived no better, aye worse perhaps.—Or we may go too far the other way and not discern the spirits, may conduct ourselves without any prudence and foresight toward those of different views, acting toward those who are strangers to our faith, even opponents of it, with the greatest friendliness and intimacy, as if there were no dissimilarity between those without and those within: this is not the wis-

dom of the friends of the Lord.—A lazy weakness and leniency is not worthy of the truth, it brings scandal soon.

Heubner:—The more remiss in prayer, the more unfruitful is it.—The door of the heart is not to be broken through, the mind must open it.—Christianity recognizes some esoterics and exoterics.—What is Christian grace? Something different from the Grecian. It is the expression which arouses a sacred pleasure in the person and makes it sacred love felt.—Nitzsch:—Continue in prayer! 1) We should strive to follow in their fulness the occasions thereto afforded us by God; 2) Seek in definite needs and desires to strengthen and perfect our prayer before God, or, in respect to our pilgrimage in general as well as in special states, continue in prayer.

[Burkitt:—Ver. 2. Need will make us beggars, but grace only thanksgivers.—Ver. 6. Our speech must be seasoned; 1) With the salt of truth; 2) with the salt of wisdom and prudence. The people wondered of old at the gracious words which came out of Christ's mouth; and we may justly wonder at the graceless words which come out of the mouths of many that are called Christians. — Henry: — Vers. 2, 3. The best and most eminent Christians need the prayers of meaner Christians, and are not above asking them.—Ver. 6. Though our speech be not always *of* grace, it must be always *with* grace.—R.]

[Eadie:—Ver. 2. Pray, wait, be not discouraged. Beware of spiritual sleepiness in devotion. There are many reasons of thanksgiving and not the least of them is the privilege of prayer itself.—Ver. 3. The Apostle was no Stoic, he felt the need of these prayers and set a high value on them. He knew the power of prayer. "For *us* he suffered. How dear then should his memory ever be to us."—Ver. 5. The world's Bible is the daily life of the Church, every page of which its quick eye minutely scans.—Zeal without knowledge is as the thunder shower that drenches and injures, not the rain that with noiseless and gentle descent softens and fertilizes.—Ver. 6. One kind of answer will not suffice for all, but each one is to be answered as he should be. Therefore the necessity of the "grace" and of the "salt."—Barnes:—Ver. 5. If you should have cheated a man out of never so small a sum, it is vain that *you* talk to him about the salvation of his soul. He wants no religion that will not make a man honest.—R.]

IV. THE CONCLUSION

Chap. IV. 7–18.

1. Personal Intelligence.

(Chap. IV. 7–9.)

7 All my state shall Tychicus declare unto you, *who is* a beloved brother, and a
8 faithful minister and fellow servant in the Lord; whom I have sent unto you for the
9 same [this very] purpose, that he might know[1] your estate, and comfort your hearts;
With Onesimus, a faithful and beloved brother, who is *one* of you. They shall
make known unto you all things which *are done* here.

[1] Ver. 8.—The reading γνῶτε–ἡμῶν, A. B. and others is better supported than γνῶ–ὑμῶν. In ℵ. τε is erased by another hand and η placed over ὑμῶν, though afterwards cancelled. [The reading which Braune rejects, (followed in E. V.) is best supported by versions and adopted by the following editors: Tischendorf, De Wette, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth. Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann and Meyer adopt γνῶτε–ἡμῶν. Alford thus accounts for the corrections in ℵ. γνῶ–ὑμῶν was the original reading; ℵ.[1] inserted τε; ℵ.[3] erased it, altering ὑμῶν to ἡμῶν, but correcting it afterwards.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 7 and 8 are the same as Eph. vi. 21, 22, except that here **and fellow servant** is added after "faithful minister," having the same adjective and qualifying clause (**in the Lord**) as the latter. Thus Paul makes Tychicus prominent not, merely as brother, but also as colleague, not however, ascribing apostolic authority to him (Schenkel). [If the reading γνῶ–ὑμῶν be adopted, there is a further variation from Ephesians. Since the Colossian Church was in danger, it would seem more important that Paul should know their state, than that they should know his circumstances, and hence more probable that Tychicus was sent for the former purpose. This is a strong exegetical reason for preferring the reading followed in the E. V.; **that he might know your estate.** (See Alford and Wordsworth.)—R.]

Ver. 9. **With Onesimus, a faithful and beloved brother.**—On Onesimus, See Lange's *Comm.*, Philemon [p. 4, *et passim*]. Paul calls him "brother" on account of his faith, notes that he s faithful (can be relied upon), and is dear and valuable to him. To recommend him, he places him with Tychicus, who has only an official position in advance of him. Πιστός, as in ver. 7, must mean "faithful," not "believing," (Baehr), which is implied in "brother."

Who is one of you.—He is thus described

and recommended as a Colossian, a townsman of the readers. [He who had been a fraudulent runaway slave is restored as "one of themselves," commended thus in an Epistle to be read publicly in Colosse and elsewhere (ver. 16). "How much native truth, courage, and beauty is there in Christianity, which enabled the Apostle to speak thus of a runaway slave, to the inhabitants of that city from which he had fled! What other religion in the world could have done this?" (WORDSWORTH).—R.]

They shall make known unto you all things which are done here.—[Τὰ ὧδε, "things here."—R.] In common and in agreement they will make known how it is here in general, as Tychicus will especially inform them of the personal circumstances, on account of which he was sent. This clause is thus readily reconcilable with the well attested reading. [According to the other reading, Tychicus was sent to learn officially concerning them, and to comfort them with his tidings, which Onesimus shared with him. ALFORD: "Is it likely with this re-statement (of ver. 7), that the same should be stated again in the middle of the sentence, which would be the case with the other reading (γνῶτε-ἡμῶν)?"—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

Comp. Eph. vi., 21, 22. What was common in faith on the Lord, is much more than what was diverse in station and culture. Even the position of an Apostle was not so exalted, that a Christian was not Paul's brother, and a servant of Christ his colleague.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—A Christian must not regard the former faults of his neighbor, occurring before his conversion, still less reproach him with them, rather praise and esteem the virtues, which God has granted him since.

[BURKITT:—Nothing endears persons so much to one another, as religion and the grace of God. These ties are stronger than those of nature. No such love as likeness occasions, especially likeness to God.—Happy it is, when the conversation of Christ's ministers is such, both in public and private, that they need not be ashamed to have it known, or that the Church may understand it.—R.]

[HENRY:—Ver. 7. It adds much to the beauty and strength of the gospel-ministry, when ministers are thus loving and condescending one to another, and by all just means support and advance one another's reputation.—Ver. 9. The meanest circumstance of life, and greatest wickedness of former life, make no difference in the spiritual relation among sincere Christians: they partake of the same privileges, and are entitled to the same regards.—R.]

---

2. Greetings and messages.

(CHAP. IV. 10–17.)

10 Aristarchus my fellow prisoner saluteth you, and Marcus, sister's son [cousin][1] to
Barnabas, touching whom ye received commandments: (if he come unto you, re-
11 ceive him;)[2] And Jesus, which [who] is called Justus, [.] who are of the circumcision.
These only [Of those who are of the circumcision, only these] *are my* fellow work-
12 ers unto the kingdom of God, which have been a comfort unto me. Epaphras,
who is *one* of you, a servant of Christ, [Christ Jesus][3] saluteth you, always labour-
ing fervently [ἀγωνιζόμενος, striving] for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect
13 and complete [fully assured][4] in all the will of God. For I bear him record, that
he hath a great zeal [much labor][5] for you, and them *that are* in Laodicea, and
14 them in Hierapolis. Luke, the beloved physician, [or the physician, the beloved],
15 and Demas, greet you. Salute the brethren which [who] are in Laodicea, and
16 Nymphas, and the church which is in his[6] house. And when this epistle is read
among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that
17 ye likewise read the *epistle* from Laodicea. And say to Archippus, Take heed to
the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it.

[1] Ver. 10.—[Ἀνεψιός, cousin. Eadie and Ellicott suggest that the E. V. probably means this, i. e., *Geschwisterkind.* See EXEG. NOTES.—R.]

[2] [Ver. 10.—[The clause immediately following "Barnabas" is included in the parenthesis of the E. V., this is unnecessary.—R.]

[3] Ver. 12.—[א. A. B. C. L. insert Ἰησοῦ; Lachmann, Tischendorf, most modern editors.—R.]

[4] Ver. 12.—א. A. B. C. and others read πεπληροφορημένοι instead of πεπληρωμένοι. [So modern editors, Lachmann, Tischendorf and others. Braune renders it "*erfüllt*;" Eadie, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth: "fully assured" or "fully persuaded."—R.]

[5] Ver. 13.—א. A. B. C. and others read πόνον instead of ζῆλον. [Others κόπον, πόθον, ἀγῶνα. Modern editors have generally adopted *πόνον, multum laborem.* The word is rare in New Testament, hence the variety of readings.—R.]

[6] Ver. 15.—Αὐτοῦ is well attested by D. E. F. G. K. L. and others; ℵ. [A. C.] have αὐτῶν. B. reads Νύμφαν—αὐτῆς. The context requires the first, since Νυμφᾶν, the masculine name, is to be retained, and the explanation that the plural refers to Nymphas and family, is unnatural. [Lachmann follows B.; Meyer, Alford adopt the plural; Rec. Tischendorf, Eadie, Ellicott, Wordsworth: Νυμφᾶν—αὐτοῦ. The variation is of little importance, has probably arisen from a desire to identify the whole church of Laodicea with that in the house of Nymphas (Ellicott).—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The *greetings*, vers. 10–14.

Ver. 10. **Aristarchus my fellow-prisoner saluteth you.**—According to Acts xix. 29; xx. 4; xxvii. 2, he was a Macedonian from Thessalonica, who had not shared the imprisonment in Cæsarea, but seems to have joined Paul on his departure for Italy, since when first mentioned again, according to Philem. 24, he was a "fellow-laborer" with the Apostle, hence not exactly in bonds (CHRYSOSTOM and others), but a voluntary companion of Paul in his imprisonment, as Epaphras is there called "fellow-prisoner," but not here.—Both seemed to have shared alternately the imprisonment of Paul. The word is further applied to captives in war, and corresponds with "fellow soldier" (Phil. ii. 25; Philem. 2). "Nothing better than this encomium" (CHRYSOSTOM). [This conjecture of MEYER respecting voluntary imprisonment is the most probable one. They may have undergone actual trial and thus exchanged places, but the reference to a bygone imprisonment (STEIGER) is unsatisfactory.—R.]

And Marcus, cousin to Barnabas.—This was the Evangelist; ἀνεψιός is *Geschwisterkind* [the relation between children of brothers and sisters], hence not cousin in the most extended sense, nor nephew (LUTHER). BENGEL: "Barnabas was better known than Mark; hence the latter is named from the former." [Perhaps better esteemed also.—R.] THEOPHYLACT: "he praises this one from his kindred; for Barnabas was great." On Mark, See LANGE'S *Comm.* Mark, [p. 4–7, Am. ed., where he is represented as the nephew of Barnabas, however.—R.]—**Touching whom ye received commandments.**—"Touching whom," Mark, not Barnabas (THEOPHYLACT): "ye received commandments" refers to a fact of earlier date, of which they are reminded. What, from whom, when and how? is and remains undetermined. BENGEL incorrectly takes ἐλάβετε as meaning *accipetis* after the manner of letter-writing, and supposes it took place with this letter through Tychicus and Onesimus; ἐντολάς forbids our referring it to letters of commendation (GROTIUS) [from Paul (DAVENANT) or the church of Rome (ESTIUS).—R.]; the plural and the omission of the article forbid our finding the command in what follows (CALVIN, BENGEL, and others). It is possible that there is a reference to the collections for the church at Jerusalem. We cannot infer from this, that there was an Epistle of Paul, since lost (REUSS). [In all probability these "commandments" had been written, and were of a commendatory nature, yet this is only conjecture.—R.]

If he come unto you, receive him.—A parenthesis, referring to a journey of Mark from Rome to Asia [ἐὰν ἤλθῃ implying that he would come.—R.], agreeable intelligence to the Colossians. We cannot accept the view of WIESELER, that Paul had anxiety lest Mark might not be well received on account of Acts xv. 38, 39, since all closer definition which would support this, is wanting. [Yet the thought is naturally suggested and is adopted by most English commentators. WORDSWORTH: "There would be something very graceful and affecting to their minds, on St. Paul's part, to St. Barnabas and to St. Mark. It would seem to say, Barnabas was tender-hearted to St. Mark his kinsman; he did for him a kinsman's part; and Mark, though he faltered for a time, has profited by his kinsman's kindness, and by my severity; and he has now returned to me, and to the service which he quitted for a time; never to leave it more. You may have heard of the separation which took place between Barnabas and me; you may have heard of Mark's dereliction of me. You will therefore rejoice to hear that now he is with me; I send you his greetings. I have given you commandments concerning him; and if he comes to you, I desire you to receive him."—R.]

Ver. 11. **And Jesus, who is called Justus**: unknown, not the one mentioned Acts xviii. 7 (THEOPHYLACT), who being described as "one that worshipped God" could not have belonged to the Jews.—**Of those who are of the circumcision.**—These three were Jews, who were attached to the Apostle to the Gentiles.—**Only these are my fellow workers unto the kingdom of God.**—He thus gives a motive for the last clause; Jewish Christian teachers were mostly anti-Pauline in their labors (Phil. i. 15, 17), hence he adds as a result for himself, and to distinguish them from such as were indeed fellow laborers for the kingdom of God, but not such as he could find comfort in: **which have been a comfort unto me.**—[ALFORD and ELLICOTT render: "which have proved a comfort unto me."—R.] Παραγορία, comfort, is found only here in the New Testament. He did not need a confirmation of the correctness of his doctrine; but comfort thus came to him. BENGEL: παραμυθία is in private grief, παραγορία is in public danger. [ELLICOTT objects, intimating that the latter admits of physical references, while the former is more ethical. There is some difference of opinion as to the punctuation of this verse, whether the stop should come after "circumcision" as in E. V. or after "Justus" (MEYER, LACHMANN, ALFORD). The meaning plainly is: that these three were Jews, and that these three alone of the Jewish Christians co-operated with him. Braune implies that others are here called "fellow-workers," but these three, distinguished by the last clause as having been a comfort, while EADIE, ALFORD and others think that he means to distinguish these alone as "fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God," *i. e.*, in its wide sense, as including the bringing in of the Gentiles. The former is preferable. WORDSWORTH remarks: "Therefore it does not seem probable that St. Peter was now at Rome."—R.]

Ver. 12. **Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of Christ Jesus, saluteth you.**—

See i. 7; also above, ver. 9. Affection and sympathy were demanded by his place of nativity, recognition and regard by his office. Then follows the description of his devoted activity: **always striving for you in prayers.**—Comp. Rom. xv. 30. "For you" answers to "of you," the external union is not without internal sympathy. The verb denotes the ardor and zeal of Epaphras, as well as the danger of the Church.

That ye may stand perfect and fully assured in all the will of God—"That" marks the purpose of the prayer; "stand" renders prominent the constancy and firmness (Eph. vi. 11; Phil. i. 27). "Perfect," more fully defined by "and fully assured" [perfect participle] as a fact of experience and continued efficiency, and by "in all the will of God" *i. e.*, in all directions (WINER's *Gram.* p. 105), as the vital sphere in which the "perfectness" and "fulness" were to move, limits the standing fast to the ethical department of the Christian's life. [On *πεπληροφ.*, see ii. 2, *πληροφορια*; also 1 Thess. i. 5.—R.] "In all" *etc.*, is not to be joined with "stand" (BENGEL, MEYER, BLEEK); nor does *ἐν* mean "in virtue of," and "will" the decree of God (BAEHR).

Ver. 13. **For I bear him record.**—Attesting witness—**That he hath much labor for you.**—This refers to the trouble which he had in spirit, as "striving" (ver. 12), and also to the time and vital energy consumed for them. Hence not merely *labor* of the spirit (BLEEK), though proceeding from this. [ELLICOTT: "labor, not such as attends a combat (EADIE) but such as implies a putting forth all one's strength." WORDSWORTH: The sentence is like a reply to those at Colosse who might have *misinterpreted* the absence of Epaphras from his flock, into a sign of indifference to their welfare. This absence was not voluntary. Philem. 23.—R.]—**And them that are in Laodicea and them in Hierapolis**—On Laodicea, see Introd. § 4, 1. Hierapolis, also a Phrygian city on the Meander, near to and east of Colosse, famous for its warm baths. The place is now called *Pambuk Kulasi.* The activity of Epaphras was wide-reaching. [MEYER: "Certainly Epaphras had labored also in these neighboring cities as founder of the churches, or at least as an eminent teacher."—R.]

Ver. 14. **Luke, the physician, the beloved.**—This was the Evangelist; the first phrase defines his station, the second his relation to Paul and to the Church. He attended the Apostle from Cesarea to Rome (Acts xxvii. 1, WINER's *Realwörterbuch*, II p. 34), but must not be confounded with Lucius (Acts xiii. 1). Lucas from Lucanus (WINER's *Gram.* p. 97). [WORDSWORTH: "It would seem that St. Luke was known to the Colossians as a Physician. The neighboring city of Laodicea was a great medical school (Strabo. xii. p. 580). It may have had professional attractions for him." The suggestion that he may have been known through his Gospel implies that it had been already written, a point which cannot be discussed here. See LANGE's *Commentary*, Luke p. 6, where SCHAFF favors the view that it was written during Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea.—R.]

And Demas (Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 10), who had not yet forsaken him. On account of the absence of any further description, BENGEL groundlessly supposes that the Epistle was dictated to him, and SCHENKEL, that the Apostle had already some disagreement with him, although in the cotemporaneous Epistle to Philemon (ver. 24) he is reckoned before Luke as a fellow laborer. [MEYER also deems this probable.—R.]

Messages. Vers. 15–17.

Ver. 15. **Salute the brethren who are in Laodicea.**—This shows the proximity and close union of the two Churches.—**And Nymphas, and the church which is in his house.**—"And" joins one person of Laodicea, giving him prominence, *viz.*, Nymphas, adding also, as the motive, this distinction: "and the church which is in his house." Comp. Philem. 2; Rom. xvi. 6; 1 Cor. xvi. 19. Such churches included not only the members of the family and intimate acquaintances (Greek fathers, ERASMUS and others), as if the reading were *τῆς οἰκίας*, but all those who assembled together there for worship. It is incorrect to understand by this the whole Church at Laodicea (BAEHR)="which are in Laodicea. GROTIUS improperly places Nymphas and his house in the neighborhood of Laodicea.

Ver. 16. **And when this epistle is read among you.**—Undoubtedly he means the Epistle to the Colossians lying before them (see WINER's *Gram.* p. 102). The verb (*ἀναγνωσθῇ*) marks the reading as an understanding on the part of the readers answering to that of the author, referring to the meaning of what was written, while "*legere*" refers merely to the form, the letters taken together. "Reading it aloud to others" (*vorlesen*) is not implied in the word, but in the circumstances, as 1 Thess. v. 27, in the dative; 2 Cor. iii. 15; Acts xv. 21, in the times and the object.—**Cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans**—"Cause that" gives prominence to the purpose as in Jno. xi. 27. This injunction grows out of the similar circumstances, explained and conditioned by the proximity and connection of the two Churches.

And that ye likewise read that from Laodicea.—"That from Laodicea" is placed first for emphasis to mark the antithesis. See WINER's *Gram.* p. 511. "Ye likewise" places the Colossians beside the Laodiceans, after whom they also should read the Epistle. Evidently then a letter written *to* the Laodiceans is meant, which the Colossians should cause to be forwarded to them from Laodicea. See WINER's *Gram.* p. 584. The context indicates that Paul had written it, since otherwise he would not have known that the Laodiceans had one, and what its contents were. He had probably written and sent it at the same time, counting upon the oral information of Tychicus (ver. 9), and was certainly induced to do so by Epaphras (ver. 13). But nothing further is known save the admission that it is lost, as indeed the Canon of Muratori cites an Epistle to the Laodiceans (comp. *Introd.* to *Ephesians*, § 5, 1). [As usual, where nothing is known, conjectures are abundant.—R.] The following opinions are inadmissible: that it was a letter written *from* Laodicea to Paul (ERASMUS, CALVIN) [so A. ALEXANDER, *Canon*, p. 296—R.]; or one written thence by Paul, as 1 Tim. (THEO-

PHYLACT); or the Epistles to Philemon (WIESELER, THIERSCH); that it was a purely private letter without appropriate doctrinal contents, a mere note, though of great value for the social relations and personal apprehension of those receiving it; that it was 1 John (LIGHTFOOT), or Hebrews (STEIN), or even Ephesians (BAEHR, MEYER, BLEEK) [CONYBEARE and HOWSON, I., 394–8, where this view is advocated at length—R.]. The Apocryphal Latin Epistle to the Laodiceans, first translated into Greek by ELIAS HUTHER (1699), and inserted in German Bibles before that of LUTHER, a poor bungling affair of twenty verses, cannot be the one referred to. [MACKNIGHT's conjecture, deemed probable by MIDDLETON, BLUNT and WORDSWORTH, is "that the Apostle sent the Ephesians word by Tychicus, who carried their letter, to send a copy of it to the Laodiceans, with an order to them to communicate it to the Colossians." WORDSWORTH remarks: that *all* St. Paul's Epistles were designed for *general* circulation. ELLICOTT *in loco*, after a clear statement, inclines to the view "that an actual Epistle to the Laodiceans is here alluded to, which possibly, from its similarity to its sister Epistle, it has not pleased God to preserve to us." EADIE: "Probably it was wholly of a temporary and local nature. An inspired writing is not necessarily a canonical one." The two leading hypotheses are: *a*) That it was the Epistle to the Ephesians, 1) regarded as an encyclical letter; 2) or, as addressed to the Laodiceans originally; 3) or circulating as MACKNIGHT suggests; all of which are open to great objections *). *b*) An Epistle now lost, for on exegetical grounds we must believe that it was a letter which the Laodiceans had or would have received, to come to Colosse from them. The latter is most probable, and does not involve the loss of a canonical book. (So BARNES.)—R.]

Ver. 17. **And say to Archippus.**—(Philem. 2, "our fellow soldier"). He was doubtless a Colossian.—**Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord.**—An exhortation corresponding with the recognition in the other Epistle (Philem. 2), hence not a reproof, as though great attention were needful (SCHENKEL). Comp. 1 Cor. i. 26; x. 18; Phil. iii. 2. "Which thou hast received in the Lord" describes the kind of ministry meant; as to its origin, it was delivered to him (BENGEL: *vocatione mediata*), for the Church indeed, but not more closely described. It is arbitrary to regard it as the diaconate or administration of the episcopate during the absence of Epaphras (ESTIUS) [ELLICOTT and WORDSWORTH deem this not improbable—R.]; so also the opinion that he was a young man (EWALD), or now feeble from age (BENGEL). "In the Lord" is not = "from the Lord" (BAEHR), nor "for the sake of the Lord" (FLATT), nor "according to the precepts of the Lord" (GROTIUS, who joins it with "fulfil"); it simply denotes the sphere in which the ministry moved, marking a responsible position. Comp. Acts xx. 24. [ALFORD: "The sphere of the *reception* of the ministry; in which the recipient lived and moved and promised at his ordination; not of the ministry itself." This is more accurate.—R.]

The purpose of taking heed to the ministry: **that thou fulfil it.**—It is not trajection: "that thou fulfil the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord" (GROTIUS and others). See 2 Jno. 8. Comp. Acts xii. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 5. Nor is there any reproof here, only exhortation, the circumstances of the Church being a motive for it; the service must be fully rendered to guard the Church from corruption. It must be noticed that the Church should thus speak to Archippus, in the words of the Apostle, however. [EADIE: "It was an admonition of Paul to Archippus through the Church." THEOPHYLACT finds in it also a command to the flock to recognize and obey the Pastor. This may be implied, but this interpretation belongs to a later age. See ALFORD, MEYER. Also WORDSWORTH, who quotes Theophylact with approval.—R.]

* [Comp. ALFORD III. Prolegg. pp. 17, 18, against 1) and 2), and ELLICOTT *in loco* against 3), which is by far the least improbable conjecture.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Men may be against us, yet not against Christ.* In the various apprehensions of the all-important matter, affecting and effecting the salvation of the soul, *viz.*, Christianity and the Person of Christ, and amid all contrary and trying experiences, the clear view and impartial judgment should and will yet discover, that some are fellow-laborers, even if very few occupy precisely the same stand-point, and share the same views and methods. Only these three Jewish Christian teachers are comforting helpers and friends, yet he recognizes others still as his "fellow workers" unto the kingdom of God, and Paul does not regard *anti-pauline* Christians as anti-christian people. As little as anti-catholic is anti-christian, so little is all and every thing anti-Lutheran anti-christian also, or whatever and whoever is against you, against God and Christ.

2. *Hospitality* has now an entirely different form from that of earlier times, owing to the total change in circumstances. The character of this duty and custom remains unchanged in this respect, that to the poor and distressed as well as to friends and brethren, our house offers a place of friendly reception and hospitable help, according to the circumstances and needs of the case. Our house should not at times become a public house, but in the privacy of home we should still be good hosts for Christian sociality and Christian beneficence.

3. *Firmness* and *constancy* are, naturally, fundamental traits of the character of the Christian and the Christian Church, but their foundation and element must be the *will of God* in the various relations of life. The Christian should yield to no human opinion, to no thought of time, not to worldly wisdom or to the lust of his flesh and self-will. In God's "Will" we find our "Ought," and to this our "Can" must reach. [*In Gottes Wollen liegt unser Sollen, und darauf muss unser Können gehen.*]

4. *Fervent supplication* is a duty and important work, not without labor. In it not only is the heart elevated with its love, but it extends itself, it strengthens and nerves itself for skilful action. *Epaphras*, who approached God in supplication

for his Colossians, journeyed also to Rome to see Paul, and was interested in the neighboring churches.

5. *Every Church has its heads and leaders*, as well as its members, those known and esteemed and of wide reputation, and those unknown, unthought of, hidden ones. The former are not without the latter, are for them, and these too are with the former and for them also.

6. What was then said *to one Church* was of value to another, is of value to all, to the whole Church. The "form of a servant" in which single writings of the Bible appear, as occasional letters, as shared by the whole Scripture, in this we perceive the glory of the Lord, for such means suffice for His work.

7. *Independency* Paul does not address his words to an Independent congregation of Christians. He places three congregations: Colosse, Laodicea and Hierapolis, together in union with himself and with each other.

8. Nor does Paul foster the *hierarchical spirit* of the clergy: the latter constitute a member of the body of the Church, to which the whole should furnish the impulse. The Apostle points from the Romish or Jewish Church of the clergy, to the evangelical Church of the people.

9. *The ministerial office* has a great responsibility on account of Him who imparts it, on account of Him in whom it is to be accomplished, and on account of those for whom it is to be fulfilled.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

It is of great value to know that good men think kindly of us. A greeting has in it something very beneficent. Do not forget to deliver it; do not consider such negligence a small matter. Be as careful about it as the Apostle.—Delight especially in those who gather others about them and serve the Church.—Do your part in helping every one to the conscientious performance of their ministry; show them especially their responsibility; remember, it is not enough that thou hast received, thou must fulfil, what thou hast received.

STARKE:—Every father should have and hold in his family a proper household church. That brings edification and blessing. Whoever tries it will find it so.—Reading the Word of God is not an especial privilege for this and that one alone, but for each and every Christian.—RIEGER:—We have children, households, entangling connections; and we ever say: to these too we must take heed. But "to the ministry," however, first and foremost.—SCHLEIERMACHER:—All associations of Christians in a society of personal friendship, which involve a dissimilarity to others, should end in such an understanding that each one, in his own place and in his own spirit, but joined in common love to the others, will forward the great work of blessing men through Christ.

PASSAVANT:—Ver. 10. Mark had struggled through and out of the old nature, and become a faithful servant in the gospel: we never go further in God's ways in vain.—Ver. 15. It was no slight evidence of the faith and love of this householder to Christ and His cause, that he received into his house the assembly of first Christians, these heathen converted out of darkness into light; such an one must assuredly anticipate many a pain and persecution.

[HENRY:—Ver. 10. We must forget as well as forgive.—Ver. 12. They who would succeed in prayer, must take pains in prayer.—Ver. 14. Luke was both a physician and an evangelist. Christ Himself both taught and healed, and was the great Physician as well as Prophet of the Church.—R.]

[EADIE:—Ver. 12. Love so pure and spiritual as that of Epaphras will produce an agony of earnestness.—Ver. 14. "Honor a physician with the honor due unto him for the uses which ye may have of him, for the Lord hath created him, for of the Most High cometh healing" (Ecclesiasticus xxxviii. 1, 2). It was indeed a common saying,—*ubi tres medici, duo athei.* Luke might have been an example to the profession.—R.]

[WORDSWORTH:—Ver. 14. This special mention ("the beloved") may have been designed by St. Paul to impart a Christian dignity to the medical profession, which was not held in high repute by the polite nations of antiquity; and to remind its practitioners, particularly those of Laodicea, to whom this Epistle was to be sent (ver. 16), of the honor and holiness of the medical calling, as ministering to the *human body*, which had been ennobled and consecrated by the *Incarnation* of Christ. Though special and *supernatural gifts of healing* were vouchsafed to the Church in those days, even then the *ordinary* means were not superseded, which were provided and bestowed by Almighty God for alleviating the sufferings of humanity through the art and skill of the Physician.—R.]

3. Closing words.

(CHAP. IV. 18,)

18 The salutation by the hand of me Paul. Remember my bonds. Grace *be* with you. Amen.[1]

[1] Ver. 18.—'Α μ ή ν is wanting in ℵ. A. B. C. F. G. and others. It was afterwards added in ℵ.; and is found in D. E. K. L The subscription in ℵ. reads πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς. others supplement it: ἀπὸ 'Ρώμης (A.), ἐγράφη ἀπὸ 'Ρώμης (B.[2]), ἐπληρώθη, ἄρχεται πρὸς Φιλιππηνσίους (D. E.), ἐτελέσθη πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς, ἄρχεται πρὸς Θεσσαλονικαίους πρώτη (F. G.). [Rec.: πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς ἐγράφη ἀπὸ 'Ρώμης διὰ Τυχικοῦ καὶ 'Ονησίμου. The most accurate of all these spurious subscriptions.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 18. **The salutation by the hand of me Paul.**—Exactly like 1 Cor. xvi. 21; 2 Thess. iii. 17. Comp Gal. vi. 11. BENGEL: "This verse Paul adds with his own hand, acknowledging what precedes as his own." The clause results rather from the Apostle's wish to add a word with his own hand, than, as BLEEK supposes, from the wish of the Church to receive at least a few autograph words, to which he has acceded.

Remember my bonds—especially in praying. ["Every limitation is unwarranted" (MEYER).—R.] "My" is emphatic; he is more concerned about the preservation of his person in triumphant fellowship with the Lord, for His sake and that of His Church, than for release or the alleviation of his imprisoned condition. It is a final exhortation, touching in its simplicity, not a request for assistance (HEINRICH). [The connexion between the autographic salutation and the exhortation must not be overlooked. It was the chain itself, linking his right hand to the soldier, rendering it difficult for him to write to those for whose sake he was in bonds. How natural to add, especially to these Gentile converts: "Remember my bonds." See ALFORD, ELLICOTT, SMITH's *Dictionary Antiq.*, *Catena.*—R.]

Grace be with you.—"Grace," simply as Eph. vi. 24; 1 Tim. vi. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 22; Tit. iii. 15; Heb. xiii. 25. "With you" (μεθ' ὑμῶν), also as 2 Tim. iv. 22. The grace of God communicated in Christ is externally and internally with Christians.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. More depends upon inner preservation of the person from fall and weakness than upon external deliverance from earthly distress.

2. From those who stake body, goods and life on the cause of the Kingdom of God, blessing in word and deed is to be experienced; they bless, having more than a benediction.

3. To such the Church not only owes gratitude and grateful thought, but can afford them joy and strength. So much depends on living communion with its reciprocal results.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[WORDSWORTH:—St. Paul's bonds were providential. If he had been continually moving from place to place in missionary journeys, the Church might perhaps have never possessed this Epistle. She therefore has good cause to *remember his bonds* with thankfulness. The word of God here written is *not bound.* The fact that this Epistle was written by him in this state of durance and restraint, and yet designed to minister comfort to others, and that it has never ceased to cheer the Church of Christ, is certainly one which is worthy of everlasting *remembrance.*—R.]

THE END.

